The Dissertation Committee for Josch Lampe Certifies that this is the approved version of the following Dissertation:

The Marxisms of West Germany's "1968": Remaking a Public Critique through Literary Magazines

Committee:

Katherine Arens, Supervisor

Pascale R. Bos

Kirkland A. Fulk

Sabine Hake

Jan Uelzmann

The Marxisms of West Germany's "1968": Remaking a Public Critique through Literary Magazines

by

Josch Lampe

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2021

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor and committee, without whom this dissertation would not have been possible. The University of Texas at Austin and its Department of Germanic Studies have been crucial for this research project in both intellectual and financial ways. Research grants for the summers of 2018 and 2019 from the Department and a University Graduate Continuing Fellowship from the Graduate School for the academic year 2019–20 made it possible for me to devote my energies to my project and to complete it despite the disruptions of 2020.

I would also like to thank the *American Friends of Marbach*, who granted me a dissertation fellowship to conduct research at the German Literature Archive in Marbach, Germany, in the summer of 2018. Vast parts of this dissertation are based on data that I was able to access thanks to the archivists, researchers, and staff in Marbach, especially Jan Bürger, Christoph Hilse, Gerhild Kölling, Petra Weiß, and Robert Zwarg.

Special thanks also to Hans Christoph Buch, Hans Magnus Enzensberger, the heirs to the Karl Markus Michel estate, and everyone at *Rowohlt Verlag* and *Suhrkamp Verlag* for granting me access to their archives at Marbach and permission to reproduce excerpts in my text.

Abstract

The Marxisms of West Germany's "1968": Remaking a Public Critique through Literary Magazines

Josch Lampe, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2021

Supervisor: Katherine Arens

My dissertation focuses on two of West Germany's preeminent literary magazines—*Kursbuch* (founded in 1965) and *Literaturmagazin* (founded in 1973)—and the ways in which they sought to shape and redefine a literary public sphere as a site of intellectual, cultural, and political critique during the *long '68*, as well as their role in the reevaluation and dissemination of different, global Marxisms. It combines archival research on the editorial correspondence and conceptualization of these respective magazines with a detailed analysis of their content in order to better understand the intellectual event "1968" and its immediate aftermath as part of a larger contested history of publishing practices in West Germany after 1945.

My work outlines how these two publications not only trafficked in different Marxisms at different times and to different ends, but also took part in the (re)constitution of an engaged literary public sphere through the creation, design, and circulation of competing conceptions of literary magazines. More critically, I argue that *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* suggest clear evidence of a continuation of Marxist debates from earlier eras about the links of aesthetic judgment and political action (such as the so-called

Realism-Modernism Debate), indicating that "1968" is a mere interim stage in an unfinished debate on Marxist aesthetics. My project therefore recoups a set of West German and international voices that have been too often overlooked as viable experiments in Western Marxisms within an international framework, not just as part of West Germany's nation-(re)building and World War II recovery. In other words, these magazines brought to public discussion a broader spectrum of leftist thought. I illustrate how the journals' editorial staffs were assessing West Germany by addressing its weaknesses through the lenses of an inherently international, multilayered, and often incoherent set of Marxist agendas in the making.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Setting the Argument 1

Chapter 1: FRG Contexts for Two Literary Magazines 24

Historicizing Postwar Germany: Why the Nation Took a Left Turn 25

Enzensberger's Path to *Kursbuch* 34

Historicizing the Rebellion's Aftermath and *Literaturmagazin* 40

Buch's Path to *Literaturmagazin* 49

Some Concluding Remarks 61

Chapter 2: *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* at Their Origins 63

Definition(s) of Literary Magazines: Periodicals and the Public Sphere 64

Functions of a Literary Magazine 68

Kursbuch Emerges 75

Literaturmagazin Emerges 84

Some Concluding Remarks 94

Chapter 3: The Politics of Culture in a Broken Political Culture 100

Abstract Materiality or Material Abstraction? The Revealing *Zeitgeist* of Theory 105

Back to the Future: The Activists' Legacies of Marxist Aesthetics 110

Origins of the *Realism-Modernism Debate* 117

Western Marxism: New Aesthetics for New Politics 121

From Lukácsian Realism to the Death of Literature? 125

Brecht's Flexible Realism 133

From Utopian Socialism to Seeds of Imagination 140

Some Concluding Remarks: Aesthetic Failures of the '68 Marxists 151

Chapter 4: Remaking a Public Critique, Part I: Social Functions and Limits of Literature and Marxist Literary Criticism 159

The Aesthetics of Staging History: From Dossiers to Brecht in *Kursbuch* 163

The History of Political Aesthetics in *Literaturmagazin* 171

Inventing New Political Aesthetics 180

The Aesthetics of Revolution, or Revolution through Aesthetics? 191

Some Conclusions: The New Marxist Aesthetics? 211

Chapter 5: Remaking a Public Critique, Part II: Engaged Intellectuals in a Bourgeois Public Sphere 215

Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere: Beyond the Frankfurt School 220

Kursbuch's Bourgeois Class Struggle 226

Literaturmagazin: Do Not Reinvent Marxism; Understand It! 254

Intellectuals or Workers? Yes, please! 266

Conclusion: The Multidimensional Simultaneity of "1968" 270

Limits on and Future Prospects for the Present Study 280

Some Final Remarks 286

Bibliography 289

Introduction: Setting the Argument

1960s journals such as *New Left Review* (founded 1960), *New York Review of Books* (1963), *Nouvel Observateur* (1964), or *Kurbuch* (1965) actively contributed to the "documentary turn" on a literary "market for Marx" (Niese 2017, 25). This documentary turn equates commitment and literary realism with political engagement (Roberts 1989, xv). It aims to be a "discovery process" of the "the new and the hitherto unreported, unrepresented, and unseen," and understands itself as a "conquest of reality and a weapon in cognitive struggle" (Jameson 2012, 476). This politicized paradigm shift, however, did not come out of nowhere. During the 1960s, certain changed social and political circumstances led to a corresponding adaptation of reading practices and, consequently, to a changed status of Marxism (Sepp 2019, 232).

In search of a Western-oriented postwar identity, West Germany's (FRG) political administration of the 1950s was linked to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's (1876–1967) *Restaurationspolitik* [politics of postwar restoration], military rearmament, demarcation

of the FRG against the Eastern bloc states, and anti-communist policies.[1] In the 1960s, Adenauer's conservative course developed into a new centrism, following numerous controversial events: the Marxist Left of the SDS (*Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund* [Socialist Student Association of Germany]) was removed from the Social Democratic Party (SPD), the far-right National Democratic Party (NPD) was founded, the grand coalition between the SPD and the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) was established, and the German *Notstandsgesetze* (Emergency Acts, used for declared domestic emergencies) were passed in 1968 to guarantee the government's ability to act.

The domestic political tensions within the FRG that elicited these responses were only heightened by the political outcry about international events such as the crushed Prague Spring in 1968 or the cruelties of the ongoing Vietnam War, which resonated within the FRG because of its place within the *North Atlantic Treaty Organization* (NATO).[2] Divided Germany was in itself a focal point for many of international problems of the Cold War era, and West Germany's students became increasingly

[1] The term *Restaurationspolitik* implies a "return to something previous" and is thus misleading. In fact, the economic and political orientation of the Federal Republic in its earliest years was, under the strong influence of American legislation, intended as a break with the corporate system of the Wilhelmine, Weimar, and Nationalist Socialist eras (Thornhill 2000, 137). Furthermore, it is characterized by extremely rapid economic growth (ibid., 139–140).

[2] I will provide a detailed historical overview in chapter 1's subsection "Historicizing Postwar Germany: Why the Nation Took a Left Turn." General historical post-1945 accounts—including West Germany's "1968"—are Bajohr et al. (2016), Brown (2013), Große Kracht (2005), Hecken (2008), Hodenberg and Siegfried (2006), Koch (2018), Koenen (2001), Kraushaar (1998; 2000; 2008; 2018), Schnell (2003), Siegfried (2006; 2018), and Wesel (2002). See in particular Brown (2009) or Schildt, Siegfried, and Lammers (2000) for a comparison of East and West Germany. For Europe, see Gildea, Mark, and Warring (2013), Klimke and Scharloth (2008), Reichardt and Siegfried (2010), and Schildt and Siegfried (2006). For global historical overviews and transnational comparisons, see for instance Carey (2016), Daniels (1989), B. Davis et al. (2010), Fink, Gassert, and Junker (1998), Frei (2008), Gilcher-Holtey (2008; 2018), Kastner and Mayer (2008), Katsiaficas (2018), Kraushaar (2018), Marwick (1998), and Vinen (2018).

oriented to global issues (Katsiaficas 2018, 85). The Marxist Left in particular felt that these executive and coalition-based decisions that were happening outside the democratic popular sphere called for a reaction. In trying to define an alternative course into the FRG's future, West Germany's leftists evolved various and different responses to what they felt was their government's increasing unwillingness to accommodate the realities of a new generation's experience.[3] The most evident results of their deliberations are West Germany's contributions to worldwide student protests between 1967–70 and their aftermaths. Yet, while

> only a few timid forays have been undertaken to explore the intellectual and cultural universe of the 1950s, […] the 1960s and 1970s remain almost entirely *terra incognita*, only occasionally traversed by the intellectual protagonists of those times themselves. (Müller 2003b, 2–3)

That said, most interpretations of "1968" are dominated by those who participated in the debates and battles (Vazansky and Abel 2014, 83).[4] These youthful participants are by now "increasingly graying and in search of absolution, locked in an endless time loop of ritual recollection, kvetching their way through the anniversaries that roll around every

---

[3] See Forner (2014) for a survey on West Germany's postwar history in connection to some of its key intellectuals. See also Markovits and Gorski (1993) and Reichardt and Siegfried (2010) for an analysis of the historical development of the FRG's postwar Left. For a pre-1945 account, see Hake (2017) on German working-class culture and the political history of the worker's movement from 1863 (SPD was founded) to 1933 (SPD and Communist Party of Germany [KPD] were banned). Hake's upcoming *The Workers' States, 1933–1989* will not only cover the time of the Third Reich but also provide more insights into West German proletarian culture for the period under question in the dissertation at hand. See also Weitz (1997) for a social and political history of German communism between 1890–1990.

[4] "1968" in quotation marks refers to the *long '68*, i.e. the "variety of movements that became associated with, and sometimes reached their climax in, 1968 but that cannot be understood with exclusive reference to that year" (Vinen 2018, xiv).

ten years" (Eley 2008, 41). Many witnesses of "1968," notably Götz Aly (1947–) and Peter Schneider (1940–), consequently pitched to their readership a view of the radical politics of the late 1960s that not only contradicted their own political positions of the time but also symptomatically ventriloquized the longstanding assault on the 68ers in post-Wall Germany's media (Vazansky and Abel 2014, 89).

To several commentators, 1968 was thus a regrettable mistake with many unfortunate consequences, whether two decades of terror by the *Red Army Faction* (RAF) or a post-1968 generation that often blames its failings—such as the inability to maintain successful personal relationships—on the 68ers and their dubious ideas about child-rearing (ibid.). The present project aims to "move beyond the many commonplaces about 1968 with which we have become overly familiar (not least from a steady diet of media indoctrination)" and tries to "reopen the question of what politics was in 1968" (ibid., 83).

Starting in the 1990s, German Studies research has produced extensive work on the FRG's student movement in terms of historical, literary, social, and cultural accounts, constructing in parts contesting approaches in explaining "1968" (Marmulla 2011, 286–90).[5] The last fifteen years in particular have witnessed the publication of numerous groundbreaking scholarly works demonstrating these events' multifaceted nature and offering new perspectives on the politics of the time, perhaps not least due to these scholars' greater historical, but also emotional and ideological distance from the actual events (Vazansky and Abel 2014, 83). However, from an intellectual history point of view,

[5] See in particular Schildt (2016) for an outline of different methods of approaching West Germany's postwar history.

> one rather obvious aspect of '68 has remained curiously neglected. This aspect is the actual political thought of the protagonists—or, to put it differently, an answer to the quasi-anthropological question, what did they think they were doing when they were doing politics? (Müller 2003a, 117)[6]

To be more precise, a considerable number of today's intellectual historians have argued that the legacies of 1968 have, with very few exceptions, been purposefully silenced by conservative historical narratives.[7] As British historian Geoff Eley (1949–) puts it:

> The disavowal narrative highlights the self-indulgence and narcissism of particular middle-class generations, severing the cultural dissidence of "sex, drugs, and rock 'n' roll" from the politics of 1968 and retelling it as a straightforward story of hedonist irresponsibility and excess. […] "1968" becomes joined to "1989" in a seamless story of the dangerousness of all big thinking about social transformation. […] "1989" subsumes "1968" to refute the validity of any grand-scale theorizing. (2008, 42)

Most recently, Sarah Hamblin and Morgan Adamson's work argues that despite different historical interpretations of "1968," the "political and economic foundations of the long 1968—its sophisticated critiques of capitalism, Soviet-style communism, colonialism, imperialism, patriarchy, and racism—were all but erased" (2019, 263–4). They state that a mainstream focus on the counter culture obscures what was a genuine cultural revolution

---

[6] Overgeneralizing attempts, for example made by Bopp (1984)—published in *Kursbuch* 78—only strengthen Müller's assertion.

[7] As one notable exception, Hamblin and Adamson point out the *Social Text* special issue, "The Sixties Without Apology" (1984), as "[p]erhaps the first major attempt to reassert the radicalism of the period, […] which presented the decade as a 'great historical upsurge' in which 'the global domination of capital was challenged from within on a more serious scale than ever before'" (2019, 264).

in which antiauthoritarian, antiimperialist, and anti-capitalist politics were used to critique everyday life while simultaneously creating profoundly new epistemologies (ibid.). Retrospectively, what was "truly a moment of global revolutionary possibility has since been repackaged as a set of disconnected uprisings" (ibid., 266).

In the FRG's context, "1968" and its relevance are not just marked by being the "second liberal founding of West Germany" (Müller 2003b, 12)—a claim I will return to in chapter 1. As I will show in the subsequent chapters, "1968" also marks one of many lacunas and conjunctures within Marxist theory. That said, my project aims to touch "1968" as both event and idea from a cultural and intellectual perspective, because, as Jan-Werner Müller argues, intellectual history, cultural history, social history, and political history cannot be properly separated in a thorough investigation of the history of political thought:

> [P]olitical thought is subject to both logical *and* cultural constraints. Accordingly, an analytical approach to political thought—assessing the logic and the coherence of arguments—is as indispensable as cultural and historical contextualization to understand the nature of political claim-making in a given national framework. (Ibid., 2)

For "1968" as an intellectual and political event, this becomes relevant since "it was the interplay between theory and event that made '68 distinctive" (ibid., 12). This circumstance, I argue below, has not been analyzed thoroughly for, among others, canonical reasons.

Theoretical texts around "1968" have barely been analyzed (Hecken 2008, 11), and especially West Germany's 1970s are widely uncharted in terms of their variety of approaches to Marxism (Niese 2017, 44–5). In other words, a significant amount of

scholarship has overlooked a large swath of the political landscape and intellectual history of the time: it does not give a full account of the multifaceted Marxist disputes that laid the groundwork for the German student protests around 1968 or of the intellectual debates associated with them.[8] Instead, scholars have focused on the successes and failures of these protests in simplified terms, pro- and anti-government, rather than investigating how they were structured to intervene in the FRG's public political discourses.

Much current research has taken as the centerpiece of West Germany's leftist reaction its one internationally renowned group of politicized intellectuals: the Frankfurt School and its prominent members Theodor W. Adorno (1903–69) and Max Horkheimer (1895–1973).[9] Consequently, many scholars today falsely assume that the German

[8] Notable exceptions for the postwar FRG context are rare. One is Müller (2003a), who distinguishes between four different intellectual groupings: first, the "surrealist" wing of the German New Left (ibid., 122); second, the democratic socialists inspired by the Marburg School (ibid., 124); third, Johannes Agnoli and his "anti-parliamentarist" followers (ibid., 125); and finally, fourth, anti-authoritarians such as Hans-Jürgen Krahl and Rudi Dutschke, who were fighting against an alleged *integral etatism*, a concept applied to a state in which manipulation from above is so pervasive that open state violence is no longer necessary (ibid., 132). A second yet different exception is Kraushaar, who distinguishes between *autoritäre* and *anti-autoritäre Maximalisten* [authoritarian and anti-authoritarian Maximalists], as well as *dogmatisch-rückwärtsgewandte* and *autonom-gegenwartsbezogene Revolutionsverfechter* [dogmatic-reactionary and autonomous-progressive revolutionaries] (2018, 40). Moreover, Kraushaar points out that the SDS itself was split into a traditional and an anti-authoritarian wing (1996, 234), which illustrates my previous argument that there was not *one* coherent left movement, not in West Germany and especially not globally. The arguably most sophisticated distinction is made by Hohendahl, who categorizes four different schools of thought: (1) Herbert Marcuse's writings between 1967–9 and their impact on the student movement; (2) commodity aesthetics as developed by authors such as Wolfgang Fritz Haug, Hans Heinz Holz, and Friedrich Tomberg; (3) an orthodox Marxist group around the journal *Argument* which followed the classical materialist tradition, mainly caused by a rediscovery of Lukács and Brecht; and (4), Hans Robert Jauss and the Constance School with its phenomenologically grounded reception aesthetics (1991, 159–61). I also want to mention Benedikt Sepp's dissertation in progress. Sepp is working at the University of Konstanz on a praxeological approach to the role of "theory" in West Berlins' student movement between 1961–72.

[9] For the most sustained and sophisticated account on the Frankfurt School and its relationship to the German student movement, see the three-volume anthology *Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung. Von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail, 1946 bis 1995* (1998), edited by Wolfgang Kraushaar. For detailed accounts on the Frankfurt School in English, see Best, Bonefeld, and O'Kane (2018), Gordon,

student movement was a more or less direct result of the Frankfurt School's work, despite known hostilities toward the School.[10] Yet the emphasis on this *one* version of postwar Marxism as *the* leftist voice of the era excludes other critical contributions from the political Left that had already been active in protests against the Adenauer government. In other words, most research on West Germany's student movement around 1968 so far has simplified an inherently multilayered and incoherent Marxist agenda, describing it as *one single* coherent left movement, often grounded on *one* shared theoretical foundation, namely the Frankfurt School and its *Critical Theory*.[11]

Hammer, and Honneth (2019), Jay (1996 [1973]), Kellner (1989), and Wiggershaus (1994). See Kellner (1975) for a convincing critique of Jay (1996 [1973]). See also Jeffries (2016) for a more biographical focus on the Frankfurt School members.

[10] For evidence of such misleading assumptions, see for instance Behrmann (1999, 333), Cornils (2016, 50), Doering-Manteuffel (2000, 666), Frei (2008, 93), Kraushaar (2008, 262), Kundnani (2019, 221), Mohr (2008, 42), Nusser (1978, 49), Schildt (2000, 41), Schnell (2003, 237), and Slobodian (2012, 233). Some right-wing conservative claims reach even further. See Cornils for an overview of nationalist conspiracists who believe that the 68ers were re-educated by the Frankfurt School and completed the institute's work, which, according to this conspiracy theory known as *Cultural Marxism*, was the destruction of "the spiritual tradition and values of the Germans" (2016, 82–3).

[11] My use of the term *Critical Theory* is based on Kellner, who defines Critical Theory as the critique of capitalism and commitment to socialist revolution (1975, 141). It is a "dialectical social theory rooted in the Marxist dialectic" (ibid., 138). *Dialectical* here means that the method of Critical Theory "combines empirical investigation with theoretical construction, and its object is the interaction between the individual and society, which it conceives as a dialectic of subject and object, man and world" (ibid., 139). Kellner argues that the interaction between the individual and the social world can only be grasped dialectically, because "all research and ideas are influenced by societal interests, the mode and level of production, the values of a given society, the particular conditions of life. Thus pure theory, value-free objectivity and neutrality are unattainable" (ibid., 140). Critical Theory is furthermore grounded in the Marxist *critique of political economy*, which argues that "the economy is the crucial determining factor for all social life and individual activity" (ibid.). Critical Theory therefore "accepts the Marxist critique of capitalism which sees all social problems ultimately rooted in the irrationality and contradictions of the capitalist mode of production" (ibid.). As a consequence, Critical Theory is motivated by an *emancipatory interest*, meaning the emancipation from capitalism, which makes it "above all a *philosophy of praxis* engaged in the 'struggle for the future'" (ibid.). The goal of Critical Theory is to overcome the social and historical system of capitalism "in order to provide the transition to a better, freer, happier and more rational social order" (ibid., 141). Thus, Critical Theory "is also a *revolutionary theory* geared toward the abolition of capitalism and the construction of socialism" (ibid.). See Benanav and Clegg (2018) or Keucheyan (2013) for attempts to genealogically reframe 1960s Critical Theory into the twenty-first century and to thereupon deriving tasks

The work to be presented in the chapters below departs from this common framework in order to show that, in fact, the map of *Critical Theories* at play in the FRG before 1968 was actually a quite varied set of sophisticated, well-theorized Marxist interventions with clear public identities in the era. One example: student leader Rudi Dutschke (1940–79) was not just a revolting student guided by blind actionism. Geoff Eley defines the complexity of Dutschke's thought as "anti-Stalinist as opposed to anti-Communist, non-economistic, and drawn to the philosophical critique of capitalism via themes of domination and alienation, as opposed to the political economy of classical Marxism" (2008, 46). The present study is committed to Eley's call against theoretical oversimplifications of "1968."

Such argumentation starts from the simple fact that West Germany had Marxist theoreticians (and debates) prior and in addition to what became the established Frankfurt School canon. A number of German Marxist traditions reach back far in time, but their creators died before the end of World War II (e.g. Walter Benjamin [1892–1940] or leftist-labor theorist Rosa Luxemburg [1871–1919]). Some ended up behind Cold War borders (e.g. Georg Lukács [1885–1971]), and some moved to the USA and became part of a *New Left* whose programs were much more radical in the spectrum between socialism and Marxism than was "acceptable" for the Frankfurt School (e.g. Herbert

---

and problems of contemporary Marxist theory. Recent publications such as Bohrer (2019), Buck-Morss (2019), Choonara (2019 [2017]), Eagleton (2011), Fisher (2009), Gilbert (2008), Hägglund (2019), Haider (2018), Haiven (2020), Harvey (2017), Henry (2019 [2008]), Nilges (2019), Roediger (2017), Sasaki (2021), Streeck (2016), Venn (2018), Vogl (2015 [2010]) Wark (2019), R. D. Wolff (2019), E. O. Wright (2019), and Žižek (2019 [2018]), or volumes by Bidet and Kouvelakis (2008 [2001]), Douzinas and Žižek (2010), Kandiyali (2018), Osborne, Alliez, and Russell (2019), and Pendakis et al. (2014) typify the topicality and relevance of anti-capitalist critique through Marxist theory in the twenty-first century.

Marcuse [1898–1979]).[12] Still others found careers beyond West Germany (e.g. Karl Korsch [1886–1961]), created legacies in their students that simply remained unnoticed or unrepresented in the FRG (e.g. Ernst Cassirer [1874–1945]), or were excluded from the postwar frameworks of the Frankfurt School because of intellectual disagreements while securing leftist legacies of their own (e.g. Erik Erikson [1902–94] or Erich Fromm [1900–80]).[13]

Furthermore, the Frankfurt School's own interpretation of Marxism caused disputes and disagreements among other Marxist theoreticians, especially in reference to the institute's "quite un-Marxist pessimism about the working class and the prospects for socialism" (Kandiyali 2019, 480). An example is Karl Korsch, who argued that "the people from the Institute for Social Research think that because they are merely cowardly and egoistical and limited, and not openly counterrevolutionary, that they are in some way revolutionary and ready for struggle" (1977 [1938], 284). Another example is Georg Lukács, who contended that

> A considerable part of the leading German intelligentsia, including Adorno, have taken up residence in the 'Grand Hotel Abyss' which I described […] as 'a beautiful hotel, equipped with every comfort, on the edge of an abyss, of

[12] For divergent Marxist positions between Adorno and Marcuse in particular, see Gilcher-Holtey (1998) or Kellner (1984). For accounts on the difference between the *Old Left* and *New Left*, see for instance Flacks (1998), Gilcher-Holtey (1998), Hooper (1999), Mewes (1973), Wainwright (1999), and A. von Weiss (1969).

[13] For theoretical disagreements within and beyond the Frankfurt School, see Jay (1996 [1973]). For overviews on the complex, international, and multilayered tradition most commonly known as *Western Marxism*, see for instance Jay (1984) or Kellner (1989). McLellan (1981) offers a general overview of international, historically conditioned, and often opposing Marxist approaches. See for example Elbaum (2002) for an analysis of the *New Communist Movement* that focuses on a so-called Third World oriented version of Marxism.

> nothingness, of absurdity. And the daily contemplation of the abyss between excellent meals or artistic entertainments, can only heighten the enjoyment of the subtle comforts offered.' (1971b [1962], 22)

Film theorist Siegfried Kracauer (1889–1966) expressed dissatisfaction about working with Adorno and Horkheimer and the Frankfurt School's intellectual integrity in general. During his time in exile, Kracauer was financially dependent on the Institute for Social Research. But his impression was that Horkheimer, the institute's director and editor of its affiliated journal, would only offer research grants to Kracauer if the latter's research would be strictly in line with the institute's work (Baer 2017, 7). After sending a 171-page manuscript to Horkheimer and Adorno, for example, Kracauer was outraged that Adorno revised the manuscript to 31 pages (ibid.). Kracauer eventually prohibited printing the text, accusing Adorno that "[i]n truth, you have not edited my manuscript but used it as the basis for a work of your own" (quoted in ibid.).

In his harsh assessment, German psychoanalyst and former Frankfurt School associate Erich Fromm (1900–1980) later denounced the institute's version of Critical Theory as being nothing but an act of cowardness:

> Horkheimer is now quoted as the creator of the Critical Theory and people write about the Critical Theory as if it were a new concept discovered by Horkheimer. As far as I know, the whole thing is a hoax because Horkheimer was frightened even before Hitler of speaking about Marxist theory. He used in general Aesopian language and spoke of Critical Theory in order not to say Marxist theory. I

> believe that is all, behind this great discovery of Critical Theory by Horkheimer and Adorno. (Quoted in K. B. Anderson and Rockwell 2012 [1976], xlix)

Other examples of hostilities towards the Frankfurt School stem from supporters of the West German student movement, such as Rudi Dutschke (1940–79), Hans-Jürgen Krahl (1943–70), and Ulrike Meinhof (1934–76), who intellectually turned away from the School's version of Marxism.[14]

The German-Italian Marxist theoretician Johannes Agnoli (1925–2003) is exemplary, as he labels the Frankfurt School's interpretation of Marxism a "Seminarmarxismus" [seminar Marxism], which emphasizes the scholastic tone of the institute's post-1945 approach to Critical Theory (1998, 254). Against the common assumptions mentioned above, Agnoli considers it wrong to identify the theoretical positions of the Frankfurt School with those of the student movement (ibid.). Still, few scholars have agreed to Agnoli's assertion by stating that historical and popular memory has underplayed the contributions of other Marxist theoreticians—in particular Wolfgang Abendroth (1906–85) and the Marburg School—to New Left discourse in favor of the focus on "the academics of the Frankfurt School" that Agnoli proposed (Slobodian 2012, 233).[15] Yet others, such as Douglas Kellner (1943–), even question whether the Frankfurt School associates after 1945 were Marxists at all. Kellner argues that, whereas the

[14] In January 1969, a group of SDS students led by Krahl occupied a seminar room and refused requests from Adorno and his colleague Jürgen Habermas (1929–) to leave. Adorno eventually called the police which arrested the protesting students. A flyer distributed in April of that year by sociology students declared: "Adorno as institution is dead"—a statement that illustrates the students' anger against the Frankfurt School members and their solely theory-based version of Marxism without practical applications (Jeffries 2016, 345).

[15] On the significance of Abendroth and the Marburg School, see Hüttig and Raphael (1999).

institute's agenda until the early 1940s "was committed to a radical program of social inquiry and change" (Kellner 1975, 144), Adorno and Horkheimer after 1945 "abandoned any revolutionary intentions" (ibid., 146), "their theory became further and further removed from any praxis" (ibid., 147), and their works "contained an attack on some of the most central Marxist conceptions that they had earlier accepted" (ibid.).

Outside of German Studies and from a generally non-Marxist (mainly anglophone) perspective, Cultural Studies scholars have criticized the Frankfurt School for its "mandarin elitism" (Nealon and Irr 2002, 3):

> Frankfurt School theorists put forth a totalizing view of culture as somehow controlled by capitalist masters; they are far too sober, serious, and dire in their condemnations of everyday life and its pleasures; and the most serious and universal charge, Frankfurt School theorists are painted as cultural elitists who evidence little faith in the agency of the common person, and show no interest whatsoever in uncovering the hidden subversive codes seemingly buried in the rituals and products of popular culture. (ibid.)

Especially Adorno's and Horkheimer's theory of the Culture Industry, to which I will return in the subchapter "Enzensberger's Path to *Kursbuch*," is subject to criticism in cultural studies, since "Adorno and Horkheimer neglect what was to become central to cultural studies: the ways in which the culture industry, while in the service of organized capital, also provides the opportunities for all kinds of individual and collective creativity and decoding" (During 1993, 30).[16]

[16] See the anthology *Rethinking the Frankfurt School: Alternative Legacies of Cultural Critique* (2002), edited by Nealon and Irr, for insightful reexaminations of the Frankfurt School and its critics.

In brief, the various stands of post-1945 West German Marxist thought remain clearly a disputed and complex intellectual landscape that has not been thoroughly investigated by contemporary scholars. The question of what it meant to be *leftist* around 1968 thus remains either nebulous or oversimplified, if its focus is the Frankfurt School alone. Recent studies may have reduced and problematized the Frankfurt School's theoretical impact on West Germany's "1968," but the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research still remains in the center of analysis. An illustrative example is Kundnani (2019), who, on the one hand, does identify generalizations in the relationship between the Frankfurt School and the FRG's student movement, but who, on the other hand, does not acknowledge any deviating Marxist approaches outside the Frankfurt School in explaining West Germany's "1968" as a Marxist project:

> Neither the student movement nor the Frankfurt School was a homogenous bloc. Rather, the fault lines in the fraught debates prompted by the events of 1967–1969 were almost as much between members of the student movement and between members of the Frankfurt School as between the student movement and the Frankfurt School. (Ibid., 232)

With respect to critical Marxist contributions to practical politics, I therefore agree with the assessment that "1968 remains an event in search of an interpretation" (Müller 2003b, 11). In the chapters that follow, I aim at filling in this missing cultural and intellectual history by bringing into focus how various projects in that era's Marxist criticism were conceived, used, disseminated, and transformed in the postwar FRG.

It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to provide an exhaustive overview of Marxist criticism in the twentieth century. Thus I will constrain my investigation historically around the idea of the *long '68*, a concept which frames the student movement as an intellectual and international event whose aftermath lasted beyond the 1960s. Vinen, for example, distinguished between *1968*, by which he understands a single eventful year, and *'68* or the *long '68*, meaning "the variety of movements that became associated with, and sometimes reached their climax in, 1968 but that cannot be understood with exclusive reference to that year" (2018, xiv). Similarly, Niese suggests that "1968" is a substitute cipher for several historical events that culminated in 1968 but that ultimately every nation has its own "1968" (2017, 40–1)—if one wants to follow such a narrative limited in itself by national borders. In the case of West Germany, Vinen illustrates the importance of taking the *long '68*-approach:

> An account of Germany that stopped in 1968 would show a student movement that had broken up, one that stopped in the autumn of 1977 would present terrorism as a major legacy of 68, one that stopped ten or twenty years later would concentrate on the origins of the Green Party and a new kind of democratic politics. (2018, 15)

In addition to entering the present dissertation from a standpoint of the *long '68*, my focus will not be on the leftists' party politics, but rather on Marxist debates in the cultural sphere.

My assertions will be substantiated by looking at the landscape of 1960s and 1970s German Marxisms through the lens of the two "literary" magazines *Kursbuch* (founded

1965 by Hans Magnus Enzensberger [1929–]) and *Literaturmagazin* (founded 1973 by Hans Christoph Buch [1944–]) as two case studies of central sites where Marxist and leftist arguments were developed and circulated (often in essay form, not literature *per se*). My dissertation sketches how Marxist debates around 1968 attempted to fuse resistance against prevailing FRG politics into a counter-public sphere. To ask differently, how did they participate in the act of "bringing into the open, an expressing and making public"? (Jameson 2008, 218) Who do they have in mind in that process of making public through what channels? And lastly, how does such making public is in line or against different interpretations of Marxist thought, especially in terms of raising consciousness and mediating experience? As will become apparent, both periodicals are, after all, also a discussion forum for attempts to rebel against established literature and proposals for breaking and/or getting rid of the *Literaturbetrieb* (established literary business). In that sense, both were different spins on Marxism: the *Death of Literature* on the one hand and a utopian rewrite of aesthetics altogether on the other hand.

Circling back to the time span under investigation, these two magazines—bracketing the emergence and the impact of the *long '68*—respectively represent a public debate that helped trigger "1968" (*Kursbuch*), as an interface between Marxist-leftist commentary and those who demonstrated and/or supported the upheavals around 1968, and a transformation resulting from them that grew out of the international student movement and into a public voice (*Literaturmagazin*).

That I center my argument around these journals is no accident. *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* exemplify two different but absolutely central moments in the evolving

intellectual debates of the German and international Left—they represent two major nodes on the map of what being *leftist* meant to various groups of West German Marxists. They document and problematize the German Left's positions within leftist-Marxist thought and within a West German media landscape that was still largely in the hands of the government and "consensus-oriented journalism" (Forner 2014, 315).[17] In the tense political climate of public distrust towards the mainstream media's alignment with the government during the 1960s and 1970s, my work will argue that many leftists chose literary magazines as perhaps the only media they could have control of and which could be responsive to shifting political winds.

To this end, the bulk of my dissertation traces how these two magazines each tried to create a counter-public sphere in their responses to historical contexts, as two generations' on-going attempts to create public discourses critiquing the West. However, one must not forget the breadth of how these "literary" magazines argued: they were in fact broadly conceived vehicles for defining and disseminating leftist thought in many genres, especially essays, commentary, and reports from world leftist projects—they did not consider themselves elitist. They were designed instead to present to their readership sophisticated, well-theorized Marxist interventions that might create a new, more open set of public debates about the FRG's future.

---

[17] A noteworthy counterexample for critical journalism is the so-called "*Spiegel* affair" of 1962, in which the FRG's defense minister Franz Josef Strauss ordered an illegal search-and-seizure action in the offices of the FRG's most prominent news magazine, which was broadly condemned as an act of governmental overreach that echoed Nazi tactics against the free press (Markovits and Gorski 1993, 46–7). I will extend and problematize Forner's "consensus-oriented journalism" argument with other noteworthy counterexamples in chapter 2.

That said, I will also argue that it is problematic to define what a literary magazine *is* and *does*. Broadly speaking, literary magazines are critical periodicals that reflect on everyday culture, cultural policies, political theory, cultural criticism, literary aesthetics, and, more generally speaking, social analyses, thus providing space for non-conformist and unconventional criticism (Schnell 2003, 43). However, to what extent such expansive statements apply to *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* needs to be discussed.

This choice of evidence for the *long '68* is based on their popularity and visibility within the movements, and it corrects another lacuna in the current scholarship. Familiarly, *Kursbuch* actively contributed to the formation and mobilization of the German student movement (Marmulla 2007, 37) and perceived itself as *the* organ of the FRG's New Left (J. K. King 1974, 69).[18] However, as mentioned above, the existing research neither explicitly defines the leftist agendas behind this rebellion, nor does it recognize points of contact with surrounding debates and magazines as part of a longer evolution of leftist thought. Kristof Niese, who undoubtedly published the most detailed and sophisticated account on *Kursbuch*, also acknowledges that the scholarly landscape has yet not investigated *Kursbuch*'s theoretical and practical key positions before and after "1968" (2017, 29). But regrettably, Niese's detailed analysis treats *Kursbuch* for the most part in isolation rather than as part of ongoing dialogues and in connection to other journals (except of occasional comparisons to the West German magazine *Kürbiskern*).

[18] Retrospectively, scholars have cast *Kursbuch* as a "Sprachrohr" [mouthpiece] of a younger and oppositional generation (Heißenbüttel 1981, 45), as an implementation of Critical Theory (Albrecht 1999, 221), and as "the main public forum for the student movement" (Dirke 1997, 47). See in particular Marmulla (2007; 2011; 2013) or Niese (2017) for detailed accounts on *Kursbuch* and its origins. At the time of publication, the author's name was King and is now Swaffar.

While a significant amount of scholarship has addressed *Kursbuch* as an important voice for the West German Left, virtually no work has been done on *Literaturmagazin* at all, despite its significance for the era and its stated relationship to *Kursbuch* (treated below).[19] Niese, for example, does refer to the *Literaturmagazin* founder Hans Christoph Buch and the latter's intellectual contributions since the early 1970s (2017, 518). But even though Niese acknowledges Buch as a viable contemporaneous critic and even though he emphasizes the importance of examining "1968" beyond the 1960s into the 1970s (ibid., 19), he does not mention *Literaturmagazin* at all.

Moreover, the three major surveys on West Germany's literary magazines from the postwar era—*Literarische Zeitschriften und Jahrbücher 1880–1970* (Laakmann and Tgahrt 1972), *Literarische Zeitschriften 1945–1970* (J. K. King 1974), and *Deutsche literarische Zeitschriften, 1945–1970* (Fischer and Dietzel 1992)—all stop at 1970. This is understandable in the case of the first two surveys mentioned since they were published in the 1970s. However, the four-volume reference book by Fischer and Dietzel only considers publications after 1970 if they were closed down before 1975 (1992, 20). Consequently, the scholarship does justice neither to *Literaturmagazin* as evidence for the *long '68* nor to if and how leftist thought was transforming in the wake of the "1968" student risings.

[19] The only exception is an index of the magazine by Adam Siegel. See: Siegel, Adam (2018). *Literaturmagazin (Rowohlt): An Index*. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3c32v2rd (accessed Jan 15, 2019).

Such omissions are particularly significant because, as I will show below, they do not acknowledge a history of tension and communication between *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*, and the Marxist debates they symbolize—debates that I take as seminal for the larger map of contemporaneous Marxisms. *Literaturmagazin*, for example, confronts *Kursbuch* in its call for submissions for its first issue in 1973. Here, the magazine's editor Hans Christoph Buch and his publisher Jürgen Manthey (1932–2018) state that "*Kursbuch* got stuck on its long march through the institutions somewhere between Wittenau [an old industrial district of Berlin] and North Korea"—a sharp attack on both the West German and international Left involved in the student movement around 1968.[20] Furthermore, the fourth issue of *Literaturmagazin*, called "Die Literatur nach dem Tod der Literatur: Bilanz der Politisierung" [The Literature after the Death of Literature: Results of the Politicization] (1975), is a direct response to the *Death of Literature* thesis, which was ascribed to an article Enzensberger published in *Kursbuch* #15 (1968).[21] I will go back to Enzensberger's assessment of literature during "1968" in the subsection "Buch's Path to *Literaturmagazin*" of chapter 1.

---

[20] Unless otherwise noted, all English translations are my own. Original German quote from Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach, Bestandssignatur: A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* von Hans Christoph Buch und Jürgen Manthey vom 14.02.1973: "[…] das 'Kursbuch' ist auf seinem langen Marsch durch die Institutionen irgendwo zwischen Wittenau und Nordkorea steckengeblieben." The *long march through the institutions* refers to student leader Dutschke's revolutionary strategy and typifies the *zeitgeist* of many West German 68ers (see e.g. Dutschke 2007 [1968]). It was a gradualism aimed at shifting the terms of public debate, so that an organized Left could begin reaching beyond its marginal status (Eley 2008, 46). *Akzente* (1953–) was founded by Buch's dissertation advisor Walter Höllerer (1922–2003) and published many texts by *Group 47* members, including Enzensberger (see e.g. Krones 2009).

[21] In his essay "Commonplaces on the Newest Literature," Enzensberger argues that "Literary works cannot be assigned an essential social function" (1974a [1968], 92). In this much cited and much misunderstood announcement, Enzensberger states that literature had developed a function as a "safety valve" that decreased rather than increased the impetus toward political action (Brown 2013, 143). Since literary production takes place within the larger sphere of capitalist production, Enzensberger highlights the

By examining the tension between the two magazines as an ongoing dialogue within the Left, and by analyzing different approaches to how they looked to define a public space for progressive leftism, I will reconstruct the map of what being *leftist* meant to various groups of FRG Marxists who attempted to work against official FRG politics. I argue that, because of their prominence on the intellectual-culture scene around 1968, these two major magazines constitute a corpus which allow me to open a window into the era's left-wing debates in a way that does not yet exist in the scholarship. The results of my comparison will redefine the too narrow intellectual historiography of the existing scholarship which, as I explained above, does not acknowledge the multilayered Marxisms around 1968. King rightly points out that political literary magazines of the time period under investigation had the goal of changing society through sociological Marxist criticism (1974, 62). But how these magazines approached this change and how they argued with each other is yet mostly uncharted. I contend that the *long '68* cannot be fully understood as an intellectual event as long as *leftist thought* and *being left* remain being such ill-defined categories.

In the first chapter, I will set the stage for my dissertation by outlining the convergence of public and private forces that came together in the process of founding *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* as two different and individual attempts to create Marxist debates in postwar West Germany and beyond. First, in order to justify my

---

ever-growing ability of modern capitalism to commodify art and to destroy its revolutionary potential (ibid., 145). However, the *Kursbuch* founder never explicitly proclaimed the *Death of Literature*—those words have been attributed to him in retrospect (Marmulla 2011, 187). Thus, when I use the phrase *Death of Literature*, I acknowledge the external ascription of it, and I am referring to Enzensberger's assessment of literature's revolutionary potential, not its right to exist. I will discuss Enzensberger's essay in further detail in chapter 4.

choice of case studies, I will historicize the emergence of both magazines, including the intellectual biographies of the magazines' founding editors prior to the publication date of the periodicals' first issues. My aim there is to characterize the reputations and goals they brought to the table when planning their journals with the publishers.

In the second chapter, I will turn to the question how problematizing the existing definitions of the genre *literary magazine* helps to prepare the way for understanding the West German Marxisms around 1968 as intellectual and cultural history. I will approach this question by analyzing the editors' correspondence around the years of their magazines' initial publication to highlight their very different notions of what their periodicals intended to do beyond the traditional scope of "literature." This will not only exemplify their ambitions for each magazine, but also outlines the theories and practicalities they discuss in contacting the public. Moreover, it unveils how these editors managed to pitch Marxisms and other leftist causes to the powers that be in publishing, to gain financial and material support for projects that laid outside of what official political forces were considering at the moment. My data for this part of the event is the magazines' call for submissions, the editors' communication with each other and their publishers, and, finally, documentation of discussions within the magazines' redaction boards. These insights enable me to have a better understanding of what the magazines' objectives were.

Chapter 3 is committed to the inherited theories of Marxist aesthetics found in *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*. I will document how both journals pick up evident elements from earlier Marxist traditions and arguments, such as the *Realism-Modernism*

Debate. My aim here is to show how theory and criticism need to be contextualized to understand the specific purposes they serve, which might go beyond the theory or criticism itself. Chapters 4 and 5 consist of a content analysis of the two magazines interpreted against the background of their actual published interests and their editors' opinions. I will analyze how both magazines implemented their public consciousness-raising programs differently. The keys to these differences were found by focusing on two different themes that figured centrally in defining how their social-political critique was to proceed: the social functions of literature and that of public intellectuals. My results, to which I return in the conclusion to this dissertation, will recoup a set of German voices that have been overlooked as viable experiments in Western European Marxisms, not just as a student revolt. In brief, these magazines present Marxist ideas put into dialog with their world, both domestically and internationally.

Chapter 1: FRG Contexts for Two Literary Magazines

Intellectual history is simultaneously the history of intellectuals (Niese 2017, 28). In this chapter, I will therefore not only examine each magazine's historical background but also the intellectual biographies of the two founding editors Hans Magnus Enzensberger (*Kursbuch*) and Hans Christoph Buch (*Literaturmagazin*).[1] By outlining the sociopolitical climate in which these magazines arose, I will argue that the editors shaped their magazines as responses to a shifting political scene.

Any historical account of the magazines, however, can only partially explain the social and political forces that brought forth the global student movements of "1968" and their associated journals. Hans Magnus Enzensberger—contemporary witness of the *long '68* and today recognized as one of "Germany's most significant and influential authors since 1945" (Melin 2000, 252)—exposes the problem of past efforts to approach the events around 1968 as follows: "Every attempt to make the uproar intelligible, ended inevitably in ideological gibberish. Remembering the year 1968 therefore can only be

[1] Both magazines had different editors throughout the journals' tenure of existence. I focus on Enzensberger and Buch since they planned and shaped the initial directions of their periodicals.

assumed in the form of a collage."[2] Examining the historical events can therefore only be one part of such a larger collage. Yet it is crucial to understand to what German intellectuals like Enzensberger and Buch were responding to. Thus, I will begin the chapter by outlining in the following sections some key historical factors impacting the developments of the West German Left.

Most critically, we must remember that *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* developed at what generally are considered two different moments in the history of West Germany. Markovits and Gorski argue that the 1950s in the FRG "were a decade of repeated electoral defeat, dwindling support, and escalating internal conflict for the Left" (Markovits and Gorski 1993, 33). Two decades later, after the global student movements, "The united front of the Left, which shone through for brief moments in the late 1960s, had become all but impossible by the early 1970s" (ibid., 58). These two magazines' relationship to West German history only confirms Markovits and Gorski's judgment, as I shall document below in further detail. Let us now turn to the historical events that allow historians to posit "1968" as the axis between two different yet closely related eras.

HISTORICIZING POSTWAR GERMANY: WHY THE NATION TOOK A LEFT TURN

Intellectual historians see the relevance of the West German student movement in the fact that it "constituted the second liberal founding of West Germany—which was

[2] Original German quote: "Jeder Versuch, den Tumult intelligibel zu machen, endete notwendig im ideologischen Kauderwelsch. Die Erinnerung an das Jahr 1968 kann deshalb nur eine Form annehmen: die der Collage" (H. M. Enzensberger 2016 [1984], 25). See the section "Enzensberger's Path to *Kursbuch*" for details on Enzensberger's life and intellectual legacy.

especially important since the first had to be done for the Germans by others" (Müller 2003b, 12).[3] This founding by largely Americans began already in the immediate postwar years, when voices in favor of West Germany's rearmament and integration into the West became louder, especially due to the announcement of the *Truman Doctrine* in 1947 and the start of the *Marshall Plan* in 1948, the Berlin blockade and subsequent Allied airlift in 1948, and the beginning of the Korean War in 1950 (Markovits and Gorski 1993, 38)—West Germans saw distinct advantages in looking West for its future instead of insisting on an independent course.[4]

French theorist Michel Foucault (1926–84) emphasizes the importance of West Germany's economic development as follows. The FRG's process of reconstructing a war economy into a peace economy was guided by United States (US) policies, particularly in form of the *Marshall Plan*, which included financial assistance from the US for West Germany (Foucault 2008 [1979], 79). Historians concur about how the US impact on the West German economy started a shift in the economic structure, the theoretical shape of which since the late 1970s has come to be known as *Neoliberalism*.[5] Ludwig Erhard

[3] A first step to initiate the new Western-oriented state by "others" was through the so-called Frankfurt Documents (*Frankfurter Dokumente*) of July 1, 1948, in which the Western Allies "stipulated that a Western German nation that excluded the East Zone was to be formed after the creation of a Parliamentary Council (*Parlamentarischer Rat*)" (Uelzmann 2019, 37).

[4] But Adenauer's pursuit of Western integration was highly contested since anchoring the Federal Republic in Western economic and defense networks invariably escalated the German division (Uelzmann 2019, 41).

[5] David Harvey (1935–) defines *Neoliberalism* as "a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (2005, 2). For an intriguing socio-economic analysis of the student movement's aftermath, see for instance Boltanski and Chiapello (2018 [1999]), who argue that it was by recuperating some of the oppositional themes articulated during the events around 1968 that "capitalism was to disarm critique, regain the initiative, and discover a new dynamism" (ibid., 168).

(1897–1977), who was the Minister of Economic Affairs from 1949 until 1963 and German chancellor from 1963 to 1966, demanded on 28 April 1948: "We must free the economy from state controls" (quoted in Foucault 2008 [1979], 80). The model of the *Social Market Economy*, which Erhard put forward as the CDU-manifesto, was in many respects a "compromise between models of dirigistic and non-interventionist economic administration," while nonetheless being based on free competition (Thornhill 2000, 137). In practice, the FRG thus has adhered closer to a version of neoliberalism that calls for the state to work to free the markets: *Ordoliberalism*.[6] That difference is not always noted externally. Foucault argues that this "economic development and economic growth produces sovereignty" of Western Allies on Germany, since "the free market, the economically free market, binds and manifests political bonds" (Foucault 2008 [1979], 84–5). As Foucault strikingly states: "History had said no to the German state, but now the economy will allow it to assert itself" (ibid., 86). And *Ordoliberalism* sets the economy as the driver for that German state.

In addition to the establishment of a pro-capitalist economy that required the participation of the state, the Left's hope for a radical new beginning for the West after World War II was destroyed in another way when West Germany joined the NATO and obtained permission from its Western allies to relaunch its own army in 1955, and ultimately allowed the stationing of American nuclear weapons on West German soil

[6] *Ordoliberalism* is a term coined in 1950 by Hero Moeller, in reference to an academic journal founded in 1948 by German economists Walter Eucken (1891–1950) and Franz Böhm (1895–1977), *Ordo — Jahrbuch für die Ordnung von Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* [*The Ordo Yearbook of Economic and Social Order*]. Ordo-liberal economic theory "argued that the state should set the parameters for the competitive market, and should coordinate industrial production in the name of national interest" (Thornhill 2000, 137). See Peacock and Willgerodt (1989) for the development and characteristics of *Ordoliberalism*.

(Markovits and Gorski 1993, 35). Moreover, Cold War developments such as the consolidation of totalitarian dictatorships under Moscow-controlled parties in Eastern Europe and the founding of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), fanned "a violent anti-communism in West Germany" (ibid., 34). As it did in the US in the McCarthy-era, such anti-communist sentiments tended to include many other forms of leftism, as well. The Left's ideals of social justice, antimilitarism, and pro-labor were repeatedly dashed, if not criminalized.

To the frustration of many West German leftists in these years of the FRG's emergence, this anti-communism was advocated by both major parties, the CDU as well as the SPD (even though the former's anti-communism differed from the latter's, as the SPD openly opposed rearmament, for example). In the case of the former, Chancellor Adenauer's *Kanzlerdemokratie* [chancellor's democracy] was typified by what Markovits and Gorski consider "his readiness to abandon the sanctity of a national union for economic stability and political democracy" (ibid., 39).[7] The SPD, theoretically in the role of a left-wing opposition to the CDU, also shared Adenauer's course to the right and toward a vision of the market steering the democracy. Kurt Schumacher (1895–1952), the SPD's chairman and first leader of the postwar parliamentary "opposition," shaped his party's course with explicit anti-communism and commitment to Western capitalism (ibid., 40).

The results of this spread of anti-communism into anti-leftism are evident in rhetorical shifts in the political discourses as the 1950s gave way to the 1960s. For

[7] Markovits and Gorski denote Adenauer's chancellor's democracy a redefined "democracy" in the sense of a strong parliamentary executive centered around the chancellor (Markovits and Gorski 1993, 37).

instance, following its 1959 *Godesberg Program*, the SPD dropped its status of a "class" or "workers" party for that of a *Volkspartei* [people's party] (ibid., 34). Before that, the FRG's Federal Constitutional Court had ordered in 1956 the dissolution of the Communist Party of Germany (KPD); the unions suffered serious setbacks to their independence; and West Germany's economy, as noted above, was "rapidly becoming the free market's most ardent advocate and most envied success story" in its *Wirtschaftswunder* [economic miracle] (ibid., 34–5).[8] As a result of the dissolution of the KPD and the pro-Western and anti-communist developments that were tolerated and sometimes even supported by the SPD, many leftists could no longer find their political home in any parliamentary party—a vacuum that generated birth to the APO (*Außerparlamentarische Opposition* [extra-parliamentary opposition]) (ibid., 35).

In consequence of these political shifts, Markovits and Gorski date to the years between 1950 and 1956 the development of an independent extra-parliamentary Left in the FRG with three major episodes of political protest emerging as their hallmark public issues: codetermination (the battle of German trade unions for a socialization of key German industries), rearmament (the resistance to a revitalization of a German army), and atomic weapons (a protest against particularly the stationing of US nuclear weapons in West Germany and Europe) (ibid., 35–45). For understanding the emergence of the APO as a political force that spoke to the government but which was not part of it, it is

[8] Before the revision of the *Betriebsverfassungsgesetz* [Works Constitution Act] in 1972 and the passing of the *Mitbestimmungsgesetz* [Codetermination Act] of 1976, the FRG's workers were "excluded from all decisions regarding powers within the firm, thus weakening the German unions' shopfloor presence in a massive manner" (Markovits and Gorski 1993, 37). See for instance Wallraff (1991) for an account on the West German workers' situation in the 1960s. See Schissler (2001) for the standard account of what the *Wirtschaftswunder* achieved.

significant that this extra-parliamentary protest did not emanate from the SPD, or any political party, but from religious, pacifist, and communist organizations (ibid., 39–40). That is, they were the voice of "the people" in a country that had no binding referenda, and whose political parties were able to control some parliamentary seats from within their own spheres, not just through ballot (voters elected only the party, which set its own "lists" of those who would get governmental seats).

The result, not surprisingly, was a profound shift in attitude on the part of some of the public, in response to this postwar consolidation of political and economic power in the government. Thus, whereas the 1950s were typified by Adenauer's anti-communist and pro-Western *Kanzlerdemokratie*, the 1960s "marked a watershed in the political history of the West" and "brought a deep change in values, ideology, and politics among a large segment of the public" (ibid., 4). Under Adenauer's leadership, the political success that had generated the *Wirtschaftswunder*, West Germany seemed to have become a prosperous, respected, and powerful nation. But no small segment of the public now felt that this was a rather superficial assessment, considering the FRG's "material inequality and authoritarian structures" (ibid., 46) in a country that had achieved its goals for reconstruction through central planning (*Ordoliberalism*) and the lack of attention to inherited social inequalities.

One notable example that provided "an acid test of the viability and vibrancy of the country's democratic institutions and political values" was the "*Spiegel* affair" of 1962, in which the defense minister Franz Josef Strauss ordered an illegal search-and-seizure action in the offices of the FRG's most prominent news magazine, which was

broadly condemned as an act of governmental overreach that echoed Nazi tactics against the free press (ibid., 46–7). One year later, in 1963, Adenauer resigned and his popular economics minister and father/chief architect of the "social market economy," Ludwig Erhard (who had played a role in Nazi economic planning), became chancellor (ibid.).

Building upon what was felt to be this authoritarian and undemocratic postwar climate, both the Auschwitz trials held in Frankfurt in 1964 and simultaneously the foundation of the ultra-rightist National Democratic Party of Germany (NPD) helped remind left-wing intellectuals that postwar Germany "had not yet fully shed its anti-democratic culture and Nazi past," and leftists demanded a thorough *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* [coming to terms with the past] (ibid., 52). They criticized the fact that, instead of investigating the roots of its fascist past and the continuing role of ex-Nazis in the public sphere, West Germany "was busily constructing a self-serving ideology of rabid anti-communism" (ibid.).

With no faith in the SPD as an opposition, and without the option of turning to the prohibited KPD or to labor organizations, extra-parliamentary protest engagements such as the "Easter March" movement or the SDS (*Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund* [Socialist Student Association of Germany]) became stronger—the public took the question of reform into its own hands, on both sides, right and left. The Easter March movement, led by Hans-Konrad Tempel (1932–), was "primarily an 'ethical-pacifist milieu,' conservative in its overall outlook and hostile to communists" (ibid., 48). The SDS had initially been established as the SPD's youth organization, but because of its close collaboration with open communists, the SPD party leaders eventually forbade

simultaneous membership in SDS and SPD in 1961 (ibid., 49–50). Thereafter, the SPD's expulsion of the primarily Marxist students of the SDS contributed to the latter's radicalization and escalation during the peak of the German student movement in 1967–8, to which I will return in the section below that historicizes *Literaturmagazin*.

In addition to these internal developments, international events caused uproar within the FRG in the early 1960s because of their significance as signs of resistance to Western centralized governments and of growing "red" threats globally. In 1961, Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro openly described himself as a Marxist-Leninist. In doing so, Castro contributed as to the idea of a possible alternative to a Western-dominated capitalist world order. Same can be said about the end of the Algerian War and consequent protests against French colonialism one year later in 1962. In 1963, US President John F. Kennedy gave his famous "Ich bin ein Berliner"-speech and was assassinated only five months later in November of that year. In 1964, civil rights workers were murdered in Mississippi at the moment when the *Civil Rights Act* (theoretically) abolished segregation in the United States (US), and the Free Speech Movement started at the University of Berkeley during the 1964–5 academic year. As French and British decolonization in Africa and Asia continued, many other liberation movements also accepted aid from the Soviet Union (USSR) and referenced communist principles in emerging from the abuses of colonial capitalism.[9]

[9] Patrice Lumumba (1925–61) is perhaps the most famous example. The Congolese politician and independence leader Lumumba was one of many who turned to the USSR for aid and eventually was assassinated. His execution involved both the Belgian and US intelligence agencies (Giefer 2000).

Also in 1964, international events suggested that the Left had a role in challenging the existing order, and that the status quo of many nations was reacting brutally against that critique in other ways, as well. For instance, a military led coup d'état in the service of a conservative definition of the state overthrew Brazilian president João Goulart (1919–76), who was widely considered a communist; the Gulf of Tonkin Incident led to an escalation of US military action in Vietnam, which then escalated anti-draft and anti-war protests in the United States and globally. Such a list of national and international events that happened in the first half of the 1960s could easily be expanded upon. What becomes clear, however, is that large parts of the public in the West were interested in the Left as an alternative to the persistence of both the Eastern bloc and the capitalism that drove governments like that of the FRG and US.

One of the most prominent public voices from the FRG playing this new role in creating a Left-oriented resistance against the consolidation of political power in the state and state capitalism was the first of the two magazines that are the center of my dissertation: *Kursbuch* grew out of this anti-communist, pro-capitalist, pro-Western, and pro-military FRG political climate I just described. Its founding editor, Hans Magnus Enzensberger, responded to this political atmosphere in manifold ways, which finally ended up in the realization of *Kursbuch* in 1965. Enzensberger's intellectual origin and work of the 1950s and 1960s will be the focus of the following sections.

ENZENSBERGER'S PATH TO *KURSBUCH*

The author, editor, and arguably one of the most continuously visible intellectual figures in this emerging FRG leftist landscape, Hans Magnus Enzensberger, was born in 1929 in Kaufbeuren, Germany.[10] Growing up in the Nazi-era (and living in Nuremburg, site of frequent Nazi rallies, where Nazi journalist Julius Streicher [1885–1946] was his neighbor), he was nonetheless a child of postwar opportunity (H. M. Enzensberger 2018, 58): he studied in Freiburg, Hamburg, Paris, and Erlangen, where he got his Ph.D. in 1955 with a dissertation on the Romantic German poet Clemens Brentano (1778–1842), supervised by Wolfgang Baumgart (1910–2000) and Heinz-Otto Burger (1903–94).

In addition to this literary background, he was involved in theater productions and had an appointment as a radio program editor and announcer in Stuttgart, where he worked with the well-known German writer Alfred Andersch (1914–80). Enzensberger soon was recognized as a member of the West German literary intelligentsia. This affiliation, as I will show in the following, is the first out of three main features of his work prior to *Kursbuch*.

Although he was part of the new generation of West German literary intelligentsia, he was at the same time fairly opposed to it. He did, as an illustrative example, attend some of the prestigious *Group 47* meetings, but was always "somewhat of an outsider" (Melin 2000, 251).[11] This positionality against the grain is also illustrated

[10] The following synopsis of Enzensberger's pre-*Kursbuch* work is inspired by Melin's (2000) concise biographical sketch. For further overviews on Enzensberger's life and intellectual legacy, see for instance Arnold (2010), Grimm (1984), Lau (1999), Petersdorff (2010), Rim (2000), Schmidt (1993), and Wieland (1999). See also Melin (2003), which is the authoritative source on the link between lyric poetry and politics in the era.

[11] See Parkes (2000) for an overview on the significance and further readings on *Group 47*.

by Enzensberger's first three poetry volumes—*Verteidigung der Wölfe* [Defense of the Wolves] (1957), *Landessprache* [Language of the Land] (1960), and *Blindenschrift* [Braille] (1964)—which established him a "reputation as one of the 'angry young men' of postwar German literature" (ibid.).[12] It was in fact Andersch who classified Enzensberger in 1958 as the FRG's only *angry young man* (Marmulla 2011, 32). This title emphasized the hope for a modern, young German literature that is able to keep up on an international level as opposed to focusing on the reinvigoration of German literature which was *Group 47*'s program (Kampmann 2010, 116).[13] Enzensberger thus had a twofold role in the West German intelligentsia: that one of the hopeful *angry young man*, and that one of an established public identity, who attended the *Group 47* meetings, who was awarded the prestigious *Georg Büchner Prize* in 1963, who held a guest professorship for poetry at Frankfurt University in 1964–5, and who worked as a reader for the well-known publishing house *Suhrkamp*, the first publisher of *Kursbuch*.

The second feature of Enzensberger's work prior to *Kursbuch* was his perspective beyond the FRG's intellectual and theoretical boundaries. His several international travels and translation projects, especially from English, French, Russian, Swedish, and Spanish into German, set the baseline for what later became Enzensberger's "international reputation as a poet and essayist, particularly in Great Britain, the United States, and Scandinavia" (Melin 2000, 252). In 1960, he edited an anthology of international verse called *Museum der modernen Poesie* [Museum of Modern Poetry], which encouraged

[12] All title-translations are taken from Melin (2000).

[13] In Austria, the "angry and young" equivalent was Peter Handke (1942–), who criticized the established postwar writers of the *Group 47* with an "inflammatory and widely publicized speech" at the group's 1966 meeting in Princeton (Abbott 2000, 403).

fellow writers to use international literature as a "working annex" for revitalizing German literature and made Enzensberger an "effective mediator of international literature and perspectives" (ibid., 251). It is no surprise, then, that, as *Kursbuch* editor, he would spend time in Norway, the US, and Cuba.

And finally, as a third feature, Enzensberger did not limit himself to literature for literature's sake. His two essay collections *Einzelheiten* [Details] (two volumes, 1962; revised 1964) and *Politik und Verbrechen* [Politics and Crime] (1964), for example, investigated the flawed nature of legal systems internationally, and various journalistic writings throughout the 1960s addressed contemporaneous discussions of leftist social theory by Hannah Arendt (1906–75), Jürgen Habermas, and Herbert Marcuse (ibid.). Enzensberger's *Politics and Crime* (1964) furthermore illustrates his shift from a poet to a "politically sharp" essayist (Niese 2017, 22). Privately, Enzensberger did continue to write poems, but only 30 of his poems written between 1965 and 1971 were published in 1971 (ibid., 22–3).

In fact, Enzensberger's theoretical work, particularly his essay "Bewußtseins-Industrie" [The Consciousness Industry] (1962), which was published in *Einzelheiten*, is crucial for understanding *Kursbuch*'s primary idea (Marmulla 2013, 20).[14] The essay is based on the work of the Frankfurt School members Adorno and Horkheimer and their

[14] In Enzensberger's own English translation, he translates the essay's title "Bewußtseins-Industrie" as "The Industrialization of the Mind," and in the text he translates the term "Bewußtseins-Industrie" as "mind industry." The volume in which the essay was published, however, is called *The Consciousness Industry: On Literature, Politics and the Media* (New York: Seabury, 1974). I will use the English translation *Consciousness Industry* when referring to the German term *Bewußtseins-Industrie* because it suggests the Marxist project of consciousness-raising.

well-cited theory of the *Kulturindustrie* [The Culture Industry].[15] Here Adorno and Horkheimer argue that pop culture manipulates and exploits mass culture through cultural commodification. The two Frankfurt School associates call this manipulation the Culture Industry, which numbs and distracts people, and by doing so turns them into commercial objects, causing mindless conformity and social pressure, and eventually creates the potential for totalitarianism through the pressure of conformity (Adorno 1991 [1947]).

Enzensberger argued that the term "Consciousness Industry" better describes the primary function of the media than "Culture Industry" (Bettig 2002, 89). Rather than seeing cultural output as determined solely by the logic of capital, the Consciousness Industry approach focuses on the ways in which media is used to perpetuate the hegemony of capital through direct control over media content and output (ibid.). The basic premise of the Consciousness Industry approach is that gaining the consent of the dominated is essential to the ruling class, since the coercive nature of capitalism alone cannot guarantee its hegemony—it requires ideological work to convince subordinate classes that the system is fair, just, and "natural" (ibid.).[16]

Directly inverting Adorno's and Horkheimer's argument by stressing not the objects in this industry, but the consumers, Enzensberger's "Marxist Media Analysis" (R. G. Davis 1975, 25) is about overcoming the manipulation apparatus. In order to do that,

---

[15] The theory of the Culture Industry is based on the chapter "Kulturindustrie: Aufklärung als Massenbetrug" [The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception] from Adorno's and Horkheimer's book *Dialektik der Aufklärung* [Dialectic of Enlightenment], which was first published as *Philosophische Fragmente* [Philosophical Fragments] (New York: Social Studies Association, 1944). A revised version was published as *Dialektik der Aufklärung* [Dialectic of Enlightenment] (Amsterdam: Querido, 1947). The first English translation is by John Cumming (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972).

[16] See for instance Bettig (2002, 89–91), R. G. Davis (1975), or A. King (2007) for a further examination on the difference between Culture Industry and Consciousness Industry.

he suggests that one has to engage with the Consciousness Industry: "To opt out of the mind industry [Consciousness Industry], to refuse any dealings with it may well turn out to be a reactionary course […] It might be a better idea to enter the dangerous game" (1974d [1962], 15). And Enzensberger left no doubt whose duty it is to seize control of the Consciousness Industry: the intellectual.[17] He contends that

> The rapid development of the mind industry [Consciousness Industry], its rise to a key position in modern society, has profoundly changed the role of the intellectual. [. . .] He must try, at any cost, to use it [Consciousness Industry] for his own purposes, which are incompatible with the purposes of the mind machine. What it upholds he must subvert. (ibid.)

Enzensberger had a clear idea about how to subvert what the Consciousness Industry upholds, an evolution of the traditional Marxist tactics for consciousness-raising. Here, the *Kursbuch* founder identified a lacuna in Marxist theory, as he will elaborate almost ten years after his essay on the "Consciousness Industry" was published:

> Marxists have not understood the consciousness industry and have been aware only of its bourgeois-capitalist dark side and not of its socialist possibilities. An author like George [*sic*] Lukács is a perfect example of this theoretical and practical backwardness. Nor are the works of Horkheimer and Adorno free of a nostalgia which clings to early bourgeois media. (1974b [1970], 120)

[17] Throughout his career, Enzensberger regularly changed his positions towards the intellectual's role in society (Ewen 2013, 250). But during the 1960s, he undoubtedly acted as an interventionist and engaging intellectual (ibid., 261). During *Kursbuch*'s early stages, Enzensberger's understanding of an intellectual therefore resonated with Ralf Dahrendorf's (1929–2009) notion of a "public intellectual," whose job it is to not only participate in prevailing public discourses, but also to determine and shape them (ibid., 258).

In brief, Enzensberger wanted his *Kursbuch* to be that very apparatus where intellectuals could formulate the necessary cultural and societal criticism in order to overcome the Consciousness Industry through a "dialectic of adjustment and subversion" (Marmulla 2013, 20).

In addition to creating an apparatus that would seize control of the Consciousness Industry out of the hands of capital, a second facet of Enzensberger's life of intellectual engagement is equally important for understanding his path to *Kursbuch*. Starting 1960, Enzensberger was involved in planning a literary magazine called the *Revue Internationale*—a periodical project that grew out of protests by international intellectuals against the Algerian War (Marmulla 2013, 17). The *Revue Internationale* was intended to be published every two to three months in Italy, France, and Germany with the same content and in each country's language (ibid.). The magazine was supposed to have four guiding principles: (1) the work should be a collective and international collaboration; (2) the emphasis should be on criticism; (3) literature should solely serve the establishment of truth, not literature *per se*; and (4) every topic should be excluded that is not concerned with criticism or truth-seeking (Marmulla 2007, 39). Next to Enzensberger, the German editors were Günter Grass (1927–2015), Helmut Heißenbüttel (1921–96), Ingeborg Bachmann (1926–73), Martin Walser (1927–), Uwe Johnson (1934–84), and Walter Boehlich (1921–2006) (ibid.). The *Revue Internationale*, however, was never realized because of arguments with the publishers, personal disputes between the editors, and conflicts about the periodical's content (ibid.). But Enzensberger was in the fortunate position that Siegfried Unseld (1924–2002), who since 1959 had been in charge

of *Suhrkamp*, planned on launching a new magazine.[18] Therefore, Enzensberger had the opportunity to finish, at least for a German audience, the idea that the *Revue Internationale* started: creating a magazine that formulates international criticism on international problems and by doing so, generates what Marmulla calls a "transnationale literarisch-politische Öffentlichkeit" [transnational literary-political public sphere] (2007, 37–41).

These are therefore the most crucial aspects of Enzensberger's path to *Kursbuch*: his literary background and critical aptitude, his international network and reputation, and his wide range of projects. Together, they set the baseline for *the* periodical of the FRG's student movement: *Kursbuch*. To finish my contextualization of this time of transition for the FRG's New Left, let me now turn to one of the reactions which *Kursbuch* elicited: the founding of the *Literaturmagazin*, which argues for Enzensberger's prescience in taking a periodical as perhaps *the* mass medium of the new German Left.

HISTORICIZING THE REBELLION'S AFTERMATH AND *LITERATURMAGAZIN*

As I mentioned above, *Kursbuch* grew out of an anti-communist, pro-capitalist, pro-Western, and pro-military political climate, and it actively contributed to the West German student movement. *Literaturmagazin*, in contrast, was a product of that rebellion's aftermath—when a brief moment of leftish success was brutally put down by official reactions in the FRG.

[18] Unseld initially offered Martin Walser and Uwe Johnson the position of the editor-in-chief, but both rejected it (Michalzik 2002, 150).

A highpoint of anti-government protest in the FRG started with the shooting of the student Benno Ohnesorg (1940–67) by a policeman during a protest against a visit by the Shah of Iran to West Berlin on June 2, 1967. This event was an explosion that unleashed an escalation of violence and counterviolence between the state apparatus and protesting students, because many leftists interpreted Ohnesorg's killing as "the inexorable consequence of the callous actions of an oppressive system" (Markovits and Gorski 1993, 56).[19] Before Ohnesorg's death, the German student movement's center had mostly been focused on West Berlin. But in the week after the shooting, over a hundred thousand students demonstrated throughout the Federal Republic against what the SDS declared "the first political murder of the postwar period" (ibid.). Local protest had begun to be framed in the international language of political uprisings.

A second shooting in the spring of 1968 then caused both another escalation and the beginning dissolution of the German student movement. On April 11, 1968, anti-communist Josef Bachmann (1945–70) attempted to assassinate student leader Rudi Dutschke, and the students immediately knew who to blame. The SDS declared that "it can surely be said now, that this crime is only the consequence of the systematic provocation which the state and the Springer corporation have to an increasing degree inflicted upon the democratic forces in this city [West Berlin]" (ibid., 57). A spontaneous demonstration by students and leftists on that same day escalated "to an unprecedented

[19] In 2009, one year after the fortieth anniversary of "1968," it was revealed that Karl-Heinz Kurras (1927–2014), the West German police officer who shot Benno Ohnesorg, had been on the payroll of East Germany's secret police *Stasi* (Vazansky and Abel 2014, 89). This exposure about one of the most pivotal moments in the history of the FRG triggered a fierce debate in the newspaper feuilletons of unified and purportedly "normalized" Germany (ibid.).

level of violence and vandalism" (ibid.). The following weeks, known as the *Osterunruhen* [Easter unrest], witnessed not only "brutal, violent clashes between the masses of demonstrators and the police," they also marked both the highpoint and the downfall of the West German student movement, as I will explain in the following sections (ibid.).

Being badly injured from the assassination attempt, Dutschke left Germany and never again played the same role in public life (Vinen 2018, 184). This was fatal for the FRG's Left, since the attempted murder removed the former student leader from the center of the political stage (ibid.). The attack on Dutschke, however, was only the beginning of the movements' downfall. Contemporary witness Claus Koch (1950–) recalls five crucial defeats for the West German Left by the end of the year 1968: (1) the reform efforts for higher education were unsuccessful; (2) the Emergency Acts were passed despite the students' protest; (3) the yellow journalist publisher *Springer* kept publishing uninterrupted, although students accused the publishing house for inciting the assassination attempt on Dutschke; (4) the working class was not open to the students' socialist ambitions; and (5), the liberation wars in the so-called Third World did not transmit the hoped-for revolutionary sparks into the Western metropoles (2018, 123).[20]

Following these defeats, the SDS isolated itself more and more with "frantic militant actions" (Kraushaar 1998a, 28). This divisiveness and radicalization, to be sure, had started before the events of the year 1968. In one notable example from June 9, 1967, the Frankfurt School's associate Jürgen Habermas accused Rudi Dutschke and his

[20] See Slobodian (2012) for relations between the German student movement and the so-called Third World.

followers of "left fascism," which caused even more tension between the students and their professors (ibid., 27).[21] But the events associated with the radicalization of West Germany's Left ultimately escalated in December 1968, when students began occupying seminars at Frankfurt University (ibid., 28). In January 1969, they organized sit-ins in the Institute of Social Research in Frankfurt, in reaction to which the Frankfurt School associate Adorno eventually called the police, which then arrested 76 occupants (ibid., 29). The students furiously interpreted Adorno's action as a collaboration with a fascist police state (ibid.). As a result, Adorno's lectures were repeatedly disturbed by the SDS, and his relationship to the students was troubled until his death in 1969.[22]

And the West German student movement itself did not manage to pull off the publicity coups that, as a counter example, the US Students for a Democratic Society had managed to.[23] Shortly after Adorno's demise, and in close connection with the premature death of one of the SDS's most important figures, Hans-Jürgen Krahl, the student organization soon began to disperse. Retrospectively, scholars such as Gilcher-Holtey understand the SDS's dissolution, which officially happened on March 21, 1970, as a result of a lack of organizational skills. This became evident already in the late 1960s,

---

[21] For a concise summary of Habermas' dispute with the students, see Gilcher-Holtey (2018, 109–10). See also Hans-Jürgen Krahl's "Antwort auf Jürgen Habermas" (1971 [1968]), in which the SDS's leading figure Krahl responds to Habermas' accusations.

[22] Personal insights on Adorno's stance towards the students are revealed in his correspondence with his—as Kraushaar puts it—"colleague, friend, and rival" Herbert Marcuse (1998a, 30). See Kraushaar (1998c) for their correspondence in German and Leslie (1999) for an English translation.

[23] See Burrough (2015) and Cottrell and Browne (2018) for accounts on the US student rebellion. See in particular B. Davis et al. (2010), Juchler (1996), Klimke (2010), and Schmidtke (2003) for comparisons between the US and the West German student movement.

when the SDS split up into several competing political groups, subcultures, and subsequent movements due to a variety of internal conflicts (2018, 114–5).

Markovits and Gorski identify four different responses from the Left in regard to the looming downfall of the SDS: (1) an ideological response (some leftists broadened the base of opposition by "organizing the masses"); (2) military action (some used armed violence to "unleash a 'civil war' without seeking the immediate support of the working class"); (3) a removal from society (some retreated from politics and mainstream society through utopian communities); and finally, (4) parliamentary engagement (some tried to achieve reforms through existing institutions, particularly the SPD) (Markovits and Gorski 1993, 57–8). Each of these four reactions brought with them specific implications for the evolution of a left-oriented public sphere outside official government circles.

The first response was organized by the so-called *K-Gruppen* [K-Groups], who turned their attention from the universities back to the working class (Gilcher-Holtey 2018, 106). This attention was strictly in line with foundational Marxist works by Karl Marx (1818–83) himself, Vladimir Lenin (1870–1924), and Mao Tse-tung (1893–1976), as well as with Antonio Gramsci's (1891–1937) idea of the engaged intellectual.[24] However, that practical orientation toward the masses means these *K-Gruppen* departed ideologically from the New Left perspectives of the Frankfurt School, and reverted to "the orthodoxies of the old Left" (Markovits and Gorski 1993, 59). The *K-Gruppen* intended to rediscover the proletariat as the revolutionary subject under the guidance of

[24] In his *Prison Notebooks*, written between 1929 and 1935, Gramsci envisions a dialectical relationship of what he calls *organic* intellectuals and the working class, in which the intellectuals draw "their materials from working-class experience at the same time as imparting to it a theoretical consciousness" (McLellan 1981, 182).

an eligible intelligentsia (Koch 2018, 128). As Lenin said it himself: "Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement" (1977b [1902], 369). But by the late 1970s, the *K-Gruppen* realized that their revolutionary strategy did not conform to the actual societal conditions: the proletariat in Western capitalist countries did not want to fulfill the historical mission of being the revolutionary subject that Marx and Lenin assigned to them (Koch 2018, 150).

The second response to the downfall of the SDS was the consequence of a voluntarily chosen urban guerrilla-code, typified in West Germany especially by the RAF, who was founded in 1970 by Andreas Baader (1943–77), Gudrun Ensslin (1940–77), and Ulrike Meinhof (1934–76). Familiarly, the RAF was responsible for several politically motivated kidnappings, killings, bombings, and robberies all across West Germany (as portrayed in the film *Deutschland im Herbst* [Germany in Autumn], 1978). Researchers disagree whether or not the RAF and other left-wing terrorist organizations that originated in the 1970s were a direct result of the student movement, even though the majority of their members were university educated members of the middle and upper classes. Some scholars such as Bude consider them a direct consequence of the more general political critiques emerging around "1968" because their terrorism, he argues, followed the "surrealist impulse" initiated by the SDS's commitment to situationism (Bude 2001, 133).[25]

[25] See Aly (2008), Fels (1998), Rabert (1995), Weißmann (2018), and Wesel (2002) for rather conservative attempts that tie the RAF terror directly to the German student movement. Situationist movements such as the *Situationist International*, which emerged in 1957, aimed to "formulate a comprehensive criticism of modern society transcending traditional Marxist theory by encompassing all aspects of human life" (Klimke 2010, 55). Through the creation of provocative "situations," common actions or procedures

A more theoretical approach to left-wing terrorism, however, reveals a different perspective. These upper middle-class terrorists with their self-imposed justifications for violence acted without authorization from the majority of society. By doing so, they turned away from the core values of the New Left and its strategy of transforming society and into a more leader-oriented or anarchist movement (Gilcher-Holtey 2018, 123). Gilcher-Holtey therefore argues that, because of the departure from New Left agendas, left-wing terrorist actions of the 1970s cannot be considered a direct result of the student movement (ibid.).[26] Furthermore, the RAF also departed from Old Left positions: Marxists such as Leon Trotsky (1879–1940) and Vladimir Lenin, as well as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (1820–95) themselves, rejected self-imposed terrorism because they suggested that the relationship between the oppressed masses and the would-be revolutionaries has to be paramount (Merkl 1995, 199).[27] Such nuances are very apparent to Marxist intellectuals, but the popular media and the government clearly understood that scapegoating Marxist criticism for left-wing terrorism serves conservative, capitalist, and anti-communist politics.

A third response to the collapse left-oriented actions was chosen by groups who rejected violence, were frustrated by political activism, and refused any further confrontation with the system (Markovits and Gorski 1993, 58). Rather than destroying

---

"should be deprived of their traditionally assigned functions by placing them in a different context, thereby attributing a new significance to them" (ibid.).

[26] See Colvin (2009), Merkl (1995), and Varon (2004) for similar arguments. See also Colvin and Karcher (2019a) and Colvin and Karcher (2019b) for a reassessment of political agency and political violence around "1968," and their connectiveness with emancipation movements and gender.

[27] As I already mentioned, see for instance Flacks (1998), Gilcher-Holtey (1998), Hooper (1999), Mewes (1973), Wainwright (1999), and A. von Weiss (1969) for accounts on the different theoretical positions of the *Old Left* and *New Left*.

the existing society, these utopian communities tried to create an alternative version of it (ibid.). One famous example was West Berlin's well-known *Kommune 1* [Commune 1], which started in an empty apartment that belonged to *Kursbuch* founder Hans Magnus Enzensberger.[28] The heirs to this line of thought include the urban *Wohngemeinschaften* (communes in large, often run-down prewar real estate that had not been restored) or the later *Hausbesetzungen*, in which squatters refused to move out of buildings scheduled for demolition and redevelopment as protests against real estate speculation and what is now called gentrification, which destroyed traditional neighborhoods.[29]

The fourth response that helped preserve and transform the FRG Left consisted of former anti-parliamentary activists who eventually turned their attention to the political stage. Vinen contends that in doing so, the "German 68" was special in one particular outcome:

> Elsewhere, the protest movements of the late 1960s coincided with and sometimes helped to produce right-wing electoral victories – those of Heath, Nixon and the Gaullists. Germany, though, moved to the left in 1969. The Grand Coalition of the SPD and Christian Democrats was replaced by a coalition of the Liberals and SPD under Willy Brandt. (Vinen 2018, 187)

Brandt's government, Vinen continues, was "the most left-wing one since the Weimar Republic," and some "prominent 68ers eventually decided in the 1980s that such politics provided the best way to change their country and they invested their hopes mainly in the

[28] For the development, aims, and lifestyle of *Kommune 1*, see for instance Hans Magnus Enzensberger's younger brother, Ulrich Enzensberger (2004), and Ritter and Langhans (2005).
[29] There were also the so-called *Instandebesetzungen*, the squatter-renovators. They were organized into co-operatives and argued for renovation of old buildings rather than demolishing them (Hämer 1991, 36).

Green Party" (ibid., 188). Gilcher-Holtey points out that this new political stage actively included some of the student movement's demands. The Brandt government in fact tried to democratize the Federal Republic by reforming the educational system, the juridical sector, and the German corporate constitution (Gilcher-Holtey 2018, 116).[30]

These four responses defined the directions of post-APO politics during the 1970s (Markovits and Gorski 1993, 58). For the present work, what becomes clear is that *Literaturmagazin* developed in an especially oppositional climate in which, as mentioned before, the "united front of the Left, which shone through for brief moments in the late 1960s, had become all but impossible by the early 1970s" (ibid.). In contrast to *Kursbuch*'s active contribution to the West German student movement, then, *Literaturmagazin* embraces the rebellion's aftermath. Whereas *Kursbuch* founder Hans Magnus Enzensberger had intended to create the transnational literary-political public sphere that I described above, the founder of *Literaturmagazin*, Hans Christoph Buch, envisioned a different path, in part based on his own experiences, which did not include direct experiences of fascism. The following sections focus on how Buch came to be *Literaturmagazin*'s founding editor and what his aims for the magazine were.

[30] Others who reentered the parliamentary stage joined the newly established KPD in 1968. This party, however, was nothing more than a "branch of East Germany's SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] in the West, financed and controlled by the GDR" (Wesel 2002, 109). Therefore, the devotion and contribution to Western parliamentary democracy of those who joined the KPD in the late 1960s is rather negligible.

BUCH'S PATH TO *LITERATURMAGAZIN*

Child of the *Wirtschaftswunder*, Hans Christoph Buch was born in 1944 in Wetzlar, Germany, to a jurist father. He grew up in Wiesbaden, Marseille, and Copenhagen. He pursued German and Slavic studies in Berlin, studied abroad at the University of Iowa, and eventually received his Ph.D. from the Technical University of Berlin in 1972 with a dissertation on descriptive literature and aesthetics, supervised by Walter Höllerer (1922–2003).[31]

Before the first *Literaturmagazin* was issued in 1973, Buch published the three monographs *Unerhörte Begebenheiten: Sechs Geschichten* [Scandalous Incidents: Six Stories] (1966), *Kritische Wälder: Essays, Kritiken, Glossen* [Critical Forests: Essays, Criticisms, Glosses] (1972), and his dissertation *Ut Pictura Poesis: Die Beschreibungsliteratur und ihre Kritiker von Lessing bis Lukács* [*Ut Pictura Poesis*: The Literature of Description and Its Critics from Lessing to Lukács] (1972).[32] Buch also edited the two volumes *Parteilichkeit der Literatur oder Parteiliteratur?: Materialien zu einer undogmatischen marxistischen Ästhetik* [The Partisanship of Literature or Party-

[31] Buch's curriculum vitae, bibliography, ongoing projects, etc. can be found on his website http://www.hans-christoph-buch.de (accessed Nov 18, 2018). Höllerer is important as an author and a literary critic, aside from being a professor trained in Comparative Literature. He had several guest professorships in the US and was founding editor of the literary magazines *Akzente* (founded 1953) and *Sprache im technischen Zeitalter* (founded 1961), arguably two of the most significant literary magazines in the FRG. As a poet, he was heavily involved in *Group 47* and in the FRG's literary marketplace.

[32] The title *Kritische Wälder* goes back to the first essay collection of German philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), entitled *Kritische Wälder. Oder Betrachtungen die Wissenschaft und Kunst des Schönen betreffend* [Critical Forests, or Reflections on the Art and Science of the Beautiful] (1769). An English translation of Herder's essay is provided by Moore (2006). The Latin phrase "ut pictura poesis" is attributed to Roman aesthetic theoretician Quintus Horatius Flaccus, commonly known as Horace (65–8 BC). It means that a poem is similar to a picture, which stresses the variety of poetry and the importance of the act of reading. See Adams and Searle (2005, 78–9) for an introduction to the concept and further reading suggestions.

Literature?: Materials for a Non-Dogmatic Marxist Aesthetic] (1972) and *Lu Hsün: Der Einsturz der Lei-Feng-Pagode: Essays über Literatur und Revolution in China* [Lu Xun: The Collapse of the Leifeng Pagoda: Essays on Literature and Revolution in China] (1973).[33]

Before I turn my attention to these publications, I want to highlight one of Buch's earlier works that gives insight into his position as a witness and participant of the West German student movement around 1968. In the essay "Der 18. Brumaire des Hans-Joachim Lieber" [The Eighteenth Brumaire of Hans-Joachim Lieber], first published in 1967, Buch makes three assertions why the West German student movement is not and will not be revolutionary: (1) the West German students are only imitating a revolution; (2) they are solely *reacting* to counterrevolutionary forces rather than *acting* in a revolutionary sense; and (3), their potential role as a revolutionary subject is contradicting their social-historical position in Western capitalism. I will now elucidate these three assertions, guided by Buch's essay but amplifying their context as contributions to international Marxisms.

The essay's title is inspired by Karl Marx's work "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte" (1852), in which Marx analyses the events around Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte's (1808–73) coup d'état of 1851.[34] Marx's essay starts with a reference to German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831) and Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte's uncle, Napoléon Bonaparte (1769–1821), who seized power in 1799 through

[33] Unless otherwise noted, all English translations of the titles are my own. There are no English translations of Buch's pre-1973 works.
[34] See Margadant (1979) for a historical account of the French coup d'état of 1851.

a coup d'état that marked the end of the French Revolution.[35] Marx states that "Hegel remarks that all great, world-historical facts and personages occur, as it were, twice. He has forgotten to add: the first time as a tragedy, the second as farce" (Marx 1978c [1852], 594).

Building upon the idea that history repeats itself, Buch further develops Marx's contemplation and argues that world-historical facts and personages not only occur twice, but at least three times: the first time as a tragedy, the second time as a farce, and the third time as either an operetta or as what in German is called "das Happening" [performance art] (Buch 1968 [1967], 133). This comparison leads to Buch's first assertion: unlike the liberation wars in the so-called Third World, the "student revolution" in West Germany is not revolutionary, it is just a caricature of it ("they drop bombs there, we throw pudding here") (ibid.).[36] In 1984, French philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1925–95) would draw a similar conclusion for the French "1968," arguing that everything "that was new has been marginalized or turned into a caricature" (2006 [1984], 235).

In addition to describing West Germany's student rebellion as a mere caricature of an upheaval, Buch makes a second point against revolutionary claims of West Germany's "1968." By replacing Bonaparte's name in the headline's title with the name Hans-Joachim Lieber (1923–2012), who was the president of the Free University of Berlin

---

[35] See Doyle (2002) for a historical account of the French Revolution, covering events between 1776–1802.

[36] Original German quote: "Während dort [Befreiungskriege in der sogenannten Dritten Welt] Bomben fallen, wird hier mit Pudding geworfen, während dort Handgranaten fliegen, fliegen hier faule Eier, während dort Blut fließt, fließt hier rote Farbe, während dort geschossen wird, werden hier Reden gehalten. Hier geht es um Mensazuschüsse und Zwangsexmatrikulation, dort um nationale Souveränität und soziale Revolution […] während dort eine Revolution stattfindet, wird hier eine Urabstimmung veranstaltet" (Buch 1968 [1967], 135).

from 1965 to 1972 as well as a Marxist theoretician, Buch states that, similar to Bonaparte's coup d'état in 1799, "1968" in Germany is not a revolutionary *action* by students, but only a *reaction* to counterrevolutionary forces, e.g. to Lieber's administrative university apparatus (1968 [1967], 134). This fact, Buch suggests, makes the students' insurgence unrevolutionary.

Lastly, Buch asserts that students in Western capitalist societies might have taken over the historical role that was once assigned to the proletariat by Marx, but he identifies a fundamental obstacle that prevents West German students from being an actual revolutionary force: despite their open hostility towards capitalism, they are still in the privileged position to benefit of capitalist exploitation (ibid., 134–6). Thus, their privilege and existence, Buch asserts, is what liberation wars in the so-called Third World try to overcome (ibid.). This fact, again, makes the West German "1968" unrevolutionary because of how deeply rooted it is in the bourgeoisie. After raising these charges, the second part of the essay chronicles the events that led to the German student movement, starting from the founding of the Free University of Berlin in 1948 up until May 1967.

Buch—who was just in his early twenties at that point—acknowledges in this publication an indissoluble contradiction that most of his eager student contemporaries miss: just because the students potentially took over a social role that Marx once assigned to the proletariat, it does not mean that the students are immediately revolutionary subjects—the mere formal equivalence is not enough. Furthermore, it does not mean that the historical conditions for a revolution are present.[37] The crux of the matter is that Buch

[37] This argument was also made by Marcuse, who argued in his lecture "The End of Utopia," held at the Free University of Berlin in July 1967, that the proletariat in highly developed capitalist countries can no

realized already in the 1960s—while the West German student movement was at its peak—that important puzzle pieces on the New Left's revolutionary agenda were missing. The purported resistance by the students was not any more critical to the base of FRG society than was the theory of the Frankfurt School. I will now turn to Buch's work in the early 1970s, which I interpret as an attempt to fill in these lacunas left by the 68ers.

Even a brief and incomplete overview of Buch's essay collection *Kritische Wälder* (1972) and the volume *Parteilichkeit der Literatur oder Parteiliteratur?: Materialien zu einer undogmatischen marxistischen Ästhetik* (1972), such as I offer here, illustrates that his vision of Marxist criticism in the early 1970s was incompatible with key concepts of the Frankfurt School, with Enzensberger and *Kursbuch*, with well-cited French contemporaneous theory around 1968, with dogmatic New Left interpretations of Marx, and lastly, with Soviet Marxism. This dissonance, I argue, illustrates the existence of a complex and incoherent landscape of Marxist thought and therefore serves my overall argument.

Buch's work prior to the first issue of *Literaturmagazin* in 1973 had a strong emphasis on literary criticism and international Marxist theory. The first chapter of his essay collection *Kritische Wälder* (1972), entitled "Über Trivialliteratur" [On Genre Fiction], investigates Ian Fleming's (1908–64) novels about the fictional secret agent *James Bond*, works by the French novelist Jules Verne (1828–1905), and Edgar Rice

---

longer be a revolutionary force because it is tied into the "repressive needs of capitalist society" and therefore "no longer represents the negation of existing needs" (1970a [1967], 70). Although often blamed for endorsing violent action, Marcuse also stated that "no revolutionary class can be defined in the capitalist countries" (ibid., 64). But he also emphasized that the students' "break with the dominant needs of repressive society […] perhaps at some time will be able to play a role in connection with other, much stronger objective forces" (ibid., 69).

Burroughs' (1875–1950) fictional jungle character *Tarzan*—all texts that today are implicated in the colonial mindset of the Western powers. Part of Buch's examination unmasks, for example, underlying ideologies of sex, sadism, and commodity advertisements in *James Bond*, and imperialist master narratives in *Tarzan*. Buch agrees that genre fiction like *James Bond* or *Tarzan* does indeed typify the Frankfurt School's earlier mentioned Culture Industry because it commodifies and harmlessly renders colonialisms.

However, unlike Adorno's and Horkheimer's implications for the Culture Industry, Buch also argues that genre fiction should not simply be demonized as an ideological reaction to social conditions, a factory-made product distributed by capitalism, or a fake mass deception that produces reality-effects. While all of this is true, he suggests that the desire for entertainment, which is not wrong *per se*, can exert an alternative force that is able to combat capitalism's exploitive ideology: this alternative, Buch states, cannot be "enlightenment with a raised index finger or a cane," but entertainment that releases the audience's utopian fantasy, instead of affirming repressive standards.[38] Buch therefore ascribes a possible social-political function to literature, even to genre fiction. He continues this argument in the next chapter of his essay collection, to which I now turn.

The second chapter of *Kritische Wälder*, simply entitled "Kritik" [Criticism], starts off with a Marxist analysis of French literary theorist Roland Barthes (1915–80)

[38] Original German quote: "Die Alternative zur Trivialliteratur heißt nicht Aufklärung mit erhobenem Zeigefinger oder gar mit dem Rohrstock, sondern schönere und bessere Unterhaltung, die, anstatt repressive Normen zu bestätigen, die utopische Phantasie des Publikums freisetzt." (1972f [1971], 52).

and the theory most commonly associated with Barthes: *Structuralism*.[39] Buch attacks Structuralism as being an ahistorical and undialectical "Kriegsgeschrei einer technokatischen Intelligenz" [battle cry of a technocratic intelligentsia], and therefore nothing but an instrument of bourgeois ideology (1972b [1969], 69). After criticizing French structuralist literary theory as essentializing bourgeois culture, Buch then turns his criticism towards West Germany. What follows in Buch's volume is a reprint of his article "Von der möglichen Funktion der Literatur: Eine Art Metakritik" [On the Possible Function of Literature: A Kind of Metacriticism], which was originally published in *Kursbuch* #20 (1970). Here, Buch criticizes Hans Magnus Enzensberger's article "Gemeinplätze, die Neueste Literatur betreffend" [Commonplaces on the Newest Literature], which was published in *Kursbuch* #15 (1968).[40] Buch rejects Enzensberger's advocacy for documentary literature along with the latter's assertion that "Literary works cannot be assigned an essential social function" (H. M. Enzensberger 1974a [1968], 92).[41] In an earlier article from 1969, Buch even labels Enzensberger's argument as the result of a "petit-bourgeois resignation" (Buch 1969, 45). Instead, and by taking the example of works by Franz Kafka (1883–1924) and Samuel Beckett (1906–89), Buch contends that "the consciousness-raising depiction of alienation through art is the first

[39] See Culler (1997, 123–5), Rivkin and Ryan (2004, 51–124), and Tyson (2006, 209–47) for an introduction to Structuralism, including associated theoreticians and key texts.
[40] See Enzensberger (1974a) for an English translation by Michael Roloff. Note that here, again, the title stems from the origins of German Classicism in the eighteenth century: the great series of letters published by the *Nicolaische Verlagsbuchhandlung* in Berlin between 1759 and 1765, the "Briefe, die neueste Literatur betreffend," a collective work by several authors, including Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–81) and Moses Mendelssohn (1729–86), which were gauged at producing a German national literature.
[41] Throughout his career, Enzensberger regularly changed his positions towards literature's role in society (Ewen 2013, 250). His devaluation of literature is situated in the context of the 1960s and thus important for my work. It is, however, not a steady motif in Enzensberger's thinking.

step of its sublation."[42] This argument continues Buch's discussion of the possible social role of literature, which, as stated above, he already began in the first chapter of *Kritische Wälder*.

Buch's position regarding the social function of literature not only discards Enzensberger's devaluation of literature as socially irrelevant, he also partially redefines the aesthetic theory of the Frankfurt School associate Adorno. In his essay "Commitment" (1962), Adorno refers to Kafka and Beckett, too, and distinguishes between *autonomous* and *committed* works of art. Autonomous art is able to show the world's misery from a distance, since "it is now virtually in [autonomous] art alone that suffering can still find its own voice" (Adorno 1982b [1962], 312). Committed works of art, in contrast, are "suffocated in the cultivation of kitsch" (ibid., 318) and therefore "merely assimilate themselves sedulously to the brute existence against which they protest" (ibid., 301). The "uncalculating autonomy" in the works of Kafka and Beckett, Adorno argues, avoids this "popularization and adaption to the market" (ibid., 314). However, there is no reconciliation or subversive potential for Adorno as "[h]e over whom Kafka's wheels have passed has lost forever both any peace with the world and any chance of consoling himself with the judgment that the way of the world is bad" (ibid., 315). By contrast and in building upon the work of Walter Benjamin, Buch argues that works of art, including literature, can in fact be used for committed, socially productive, even revolutionary purposes. Interestingly enough, Buch is here in agreement with Enzensberger, who considered Benjamin the "only Marxist theoretician who recognized

[42] Orignial German quote: "die Darstellung der Entfremdung, ihre Bewußtmachung durch die Kunst, ist vielmehr der erste Schritt zu ihrer Aufhebung" (1972h [1970], 82).

the liberating potential of the new media [i.e. consciousness industry]" (H. M. Enzensberger 1974b [1970], 120).[43] I will elucidate in chapter 3 how Buch's and Enzensberger's aesthetic approaches need to be understood within the wider scope of Marxist intellectual history.

In the following subchapter, entitled "Postscriptum: Über Dokumentarliteratur und sozialistischen Realismus" [Postscript: On Documentary Literature and Socialist Realism], Buch turns his attention to the New Left and Soviet Marxists. He contends that the former's dogmatic assessment of literature with its "close association with the proletariat in the class struggle" is about to become no different than their dogmatic East German and Soviet counterparts (Buch 1972e, 87). Therefore, Buch is skeptical of both Marxist approaches. He expresses this skepticism in the last sentence of the essay through a quote by Mao Tse-tung, who was at that time the chairman of the Chinese Communist Party: "On questions of literature and art we must carry on a struggle on two fronts" (Mao 1962 [1942], 31).[44] This twofold struggle refers to both alertness against anti-Marxism on the one side, as well as precaution against too eager dogmatic defenders of Marxism on the other side (Buch 1972a, 21).

Buch's chapter ends with an essay entitled "Lenin und die Sprache der neuen Linken" [Lenin and the Language of the New Left]. He here criticizes the rhetoric of both the New Left and Soviet Marxists. One the one side, Buch argues that the New Left is

---

[43] See for example Benjamin's essay "The Author as Producer" (1937), in which he argues that since the "bourgeois apparatus of production and publication" can assimilate and absorb every revolutionary theme (1982 [1937], 262), every writer should turn from "a supplier of the productive apparatus" into "an engineer who sees it as his task to adapt this apparatus to the purposes of the proletarian revolution" (ibid., 268).
[44] Buch uses the German translation: "In Literatur und Kunst müssen wir einen Zweifrontenkampf führen" (1972e, 88).

unable to bridge the gap between Marxist intellectuals and the working class, mainly because of the former's abstract language (Buch 1972c [1970], 94). And Soviet Marxist rhetoric on the other side, characterized by its euphemistic pathos, would by no means be any practicable alternative (ibid., 96). Instead, Buch advocates the rhetoric of the Russian communist revolutionary Vladimir Lenin, which, in his opinion, is marked by a rejection of pathos, an avoidance of literary and metaphorical expressions, and a plain gesticulation.[45] This rhetoric, he argues, is in fact a revolutionary language and a product of revolutionary praxis (ibid., 93). In brief, Buch again discards the contemporaneous Marxisms of his time, practiced by both the New Left and contemporaneous Soviet Marxists as central in the first postwar generation, and instead suggests turning the focus to earlier Marxist theoreticians such as Lenin.

Lenin is also part of Buch's edited volume *Parteilichkeit der Literatur oder Parteiliteratur?: Materialien zu einer undogmatischen marxistischen Ästhetik* (1972), which I will now briefly turn attention to as it is crucial for understanding Buch's Marxist position prior to *Literaturmagazin*. This volume aims to present international contributions on Marxist aesthetics that were at the time of publication in 1972 either difficult to access or simply untranslated into German (Buch 1972a, 21).[46]

---

[45] Original German quote: "Lenin war kein 'brillanter' Redner im herkömmlichen Sinn. Seine Abneigung gegen jedes übertriebene Pathos unterscheidet ihn deutlich von heutigen sowjetischen Festrednern, deren Sätze von Sentimentalität und Feierlichkeit förmlich triefen. Er vermied literarische Anspielungen, kunstvolle Metaphern und wohlklingende Satzperioden, wie sie etwa Trotzki benutzte; auch seine Gestik war sparsam, gemessen an den üblichen Rednern der Zeit, die so wild mit den Armen fuchtelten, daß man sie im Volksmund 'Manschettenwerfer' nannte" (Buch 1972c [1970], 93).

[46] In the introduction, Buch states that the volume builds upon Fritz J. Raddatz's three-volume anthology *Marxismus und Literatur* [Marxism and Literature] (Reinbeck/Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1969), and does not include texts that were already published there (1972a, 21). In a book review of Raddatz's anthology from 1969, Buch criticizes Raddatz for excluding contributors from the so-called Third World (1969, 46).

The authors presented in the collection stretch from foundational Marxist theoreticians such as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels themselves, Vladimir Lenin and Leon Trotsky, and other well-known Marxists such as Georg Lukács, Walter Benjamin, Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–80), and Frantz Fanon (1925–61). But the volume also includes writers of the British and US American Left such as Christopher Caudwell (1907–37), Philip Rahv (1908–73), and Waldo Frank (1889–1967); France-based Trotskyists such as Victor Serge (1890–1947) and André Breton (1896–1966); theoreticians and writers from the so-called Third World such as Lu Xun (1881–1936), Fidel Castro (1926–2016), and Ernesto Che Guevara (1928–67); and rather uncanonical German Marxists such as Lu Märten (1879–1970), August Thalheimer (1884–1948), Erwin Piscator (1893–1966), and Wieland Herzfelde (1896–1988).

Despite rediscovering for his German audience Marxist theoreticians who have sunk into the oblivion of German history, or emphasizing rather unknown texts by well-established identities, Buch's text-selection is based on the following three criteria: the Marxist theorems have to be (1) non-dogmatic, meaning they need to proceed from *reality* rather than *ideology*; (2) they have to be historical, which includes bourgeois art and ideology from the past in their analysis as a necessary tool for understanding the present; and (3), they have to embrace *Parteilichkeit* [partisanship], meaning for Buch the intellectual's solidarity with oppressed classes and people (ibid., 20–1). Upholding these three principles entails a strict ideological distancing (but not exclusion) from bourgeois

---

Furthermore, Buch considers Raddatz's anthology an attempt to defuse Marxist criticism by integrating it into bourgeois thought (ibid.). Buch's dissatisfaction about Raddatz's anthology presumably contributed to the project idea of *Parteilichkeit der Literatur oder Parteiliteratur?: Materialien zu einer undogmatischen marxistischen Ästhetik* (1972).

art and aesthetics as well as from any ahistorical Marxist dogmatisms, exemplified for example by the "erstarrten Schablonen des sozialistischen Realismus" [congealed stencils of Socialist Realism] (ibid., 22).[47]

My brief and incomplete summary of Buch's essay collection *Kritische Wälder* (1972) and the volume *Parteilichkeit der Literatur oder Parteiliteratur?: Materialien zu einer undogmatischen marxistischen Ästhetik* (1972) are early illustrations of how and to where Buch's criticism is directed: towards the Frankfurt School (specifically, as I showed above, its one-sided and pessimistic assumptions made in the theory of the Culture Industry or Adorno's aesthetic remarks); towards those who underplay the social role of art in a consciousness-transforming process (e.g. Enzensberger's assertion that literature is socially irrelevant); towards those Marxist theoreticians who value *theory* over *praxis* (e.g. Roland Barthes and the French structuralists); and lastly, towards those theoreticians who turn Marxist criticism into an ahistorical and dogmatic ideology (e.g. parts of the New Left and Soviet Marxists). Instead, Buch presents an alternative path to Marxism, which consists of rather forgotten, neglected, or undiscovered theoretical works.

One tendency that I would like to point out for understanding Buch's approach to Marxism is that, with the exception of texts by Sartre, Fanon, Castro, and Guevara, all other contributions in the edited volume *Parteilichkeit der Literatur oder*

---

[47] Original German quote: "Das Auswahlprinzip ist parteilich: es richtet sich ebenso gegen die spätbürgerliche Kunst, die aus Ästhetisierung des Elends und der Entfremdung ihren Profit schlägt, wie gegen die erstarrten Schablonen des sozialistischen Realismus und seine modischen Adepten im Westen, die die abgestandenen Theoreme des Vulgärmarxismus […] als Neuauflage der revolutionären Kunst verkaufen: so als ließe sich die proletarisch-revolutionäre Literatur der dreißiger Jahre, ohne ihre historische Bedingtheit zu reflektieren, auf die Gegenwart übertragen" (Buch 1972a, 22).

Parteiliteratur?: Materialien zu einer undogmatischen marxistischen Ästhetik (1972) were published before 1945. Buch's Marxist inspiration therefore goes back to Marxist theory long before the formation of the international student movements around 1968, which is a stark contrast to Enzensberger, whose theoretical focus was almost exclusively on contemporaneous Marxisms.

What becomes clear is that Buch—in the early 1970s—was dissatisfied with the way Marxism was interpreted, including the protagonists of "1968" as well as many of their predecessors. I argue that Buch's vision of an alternative Marxism is revealed in *Literaturmagazin*, the journal he planned, executed, and edited.

One last point about Buch's work prior to *Literaturmagazin* that I want to emphasize is the reception of his work. Unlike Enzensberger and *Kursbuch*, scholars pay virtually no attention to Buch's achievements in *Literaturmagazin*. If at all, Buch is either mentioned for his literary criticism, especially the 1970 article "Von der möglichen Funktion der Literatur: Eine Art Metakritik" (Cornils 2016, 104; Thomas and Bullivant 1974, 125–6), for his personal involvement in the West German student movement (Briegleb 1993, 53–6), or his later projects long after 1968 (Schnell 2003, 570–1).

SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

I have here made the case for Enzensberger's and Buch's position within the evolution of FRG Marxisms by reference to political contexts. Both represent two distinct generations of Marxist thought, contributing to and generated by the events around "1968." Their intellectual biographies disprove any simplified and coherent accounts on

West Germany's post-1945 intellectual history. A comparison of Enzensberger's and Buch's legacies, instead, provides evidence of a disputed and complex intellectual landscape in the FRG. Their different paths, intellectual positions, and assessments of West Germany's politics and culture problematize a distinct single or simple understanding of what it meant to be *leftist* around 1968. Both tried to create a counter-public sphere as a response to their different historical contexts, and both chose literary magazines as their platforms. These magazines are therefore two examples of how Marxist criticism was conceived, used, disseminated, and transformed in the postwar FRG.

The next chapter will amplify those contentions based on my original archival research into editorial correspondence conducted at the *German Literature Archive* in Marbach, Germany. My analysis will include *Kursbuch*'s and *Literaturmagazin*'s calls for submissions, the editors' communications with each other and their publishers, and documentation of discussions within the magazines' editorial boards. The editorial correspondence for both magazines' founding editors will provide significant insight into the debates around the origins of each magazine, the on-going editorial discussions about various contributions and issues that needed to be covered, what was actually published as reactions to public debates, and finally, the journals' own political goals.

Chapter 2: *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* at Their Origins

As I have argued in the previous chapter, the literary magazines *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* grew up at two different moments in the founding history of West Germany. This chapter will document how these periodicals responded to historical events in their first years of existence, as their evolving programs are reflected in the editors' ambitions and goals for *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*. By analyzing the existing collections of Enzensberger's and Buch's correspondence around the years of initial publication, I will show why they felt the need to establish new platforms for counter-public voices, and what role a specifically Marxist approach to social and cultural criticism played in that regard.

These insights enable me to have a better understanding of what the magazines' objectives were—what kinds of publications were being invented, and what they were intended to achieve. Before I turn my attention to *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* in particular, I will define the genre *literary magazine* and its social function in the case of West Germany. This has to be tied in with concepts of influencing the public sphere. To understand the programs that these two magazines tried to implement requires us to

understand the publishing landscape and the ideologies that drove magazines into existence.

DEFINITION(S) OF LITERARY MAGAZINES: PERIODICALS AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE

The first issue that arises in understanding why a "literary magazine" came into existence is necessarily the questions of what the landscape of publishing looks like on the map of its audiences. It is important to remember that *Springer* controlled over eighty percent of German daily newspapers (Katsiaficas 2018, 86)—periodicals can thus be seen as a more independent platform. Even though Germans were periodical readers from the nineteenth century on, it is considerably less well-defined what periodicals actually meant to a readership.

In scholarly discussions of features of the FRG's literary magazines, for instance, one controversial issue has long been the actual distinction between a magazine and a newspaper. Early postwar contributions suggested that a magazine has a more sophisticated style than a newspaper (Marigold 1956, 38), and that newspaper-like publications have a higher circulation and are consequently more general in their content (Stomps 1965, 197). In the 1960s, scholars asserted that, whereas newspapers "accompany and interpret the day's events from today's point of view only," periodicals are "an expression of vigorous intellectual life in the context of both the past and the future" (Schwab-Felisch 1965, 26). To put it differently, newspapers "fill the need for information," and magazines are in turn "the result of the need for interpretation and analysis" (ibid.). Periodicals other than newspapers therefore tend not to focus on up-to-

date information but rather on editorial and critical contributions (Fischer and Dietzel 1992, 19). Accordingly, West German postwar literary magazines up until the mid-1960s fit this bill, because they seemed to address a mostly critical, exclusive, intellectual, and sophisticated readership.

In addition to the question as to whether a publication is a newspaper or a magazine, however, the situation gets more nebulous. Some scholars have attempted to distinguish periodicals into different subcategories, whereas others have suggested that periodicals after 1933 cannot be classified at all (J. K. King 1974, 1). For example, one effort, for example, to categorize literary magazines differentiates between journals that (1) claim to represent a special district of Germany; (2) periodicals which devote themselves only to the publication and re-publication of original literature past and present; (3) a group that aims to keep the FRG's public informed on current events; (4) a cultural-political type that regards both culture and politics under a special religious or semi-religious aspect; and (5) the academic periodicals (Majut 1953, 20–27). The last category, academic periodicals, is especially worth mentioning for my dissertation since in one sense, these kinds of journals may well be the predecessors of *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*, as I contend they are.

In a divided, recovering Germany, academic journals may have played a role they do not often play today. Scholars in the 1950s highlighted the significance of academic publications for the following reasons. First, these journals "should be of particular interest because of the importance of the universities in moulding the younger generation and because their contributors, almost all young, are drawn largely from the post-war

[*sic*] generation" (Marigold 1956, 42). This attention on magazines that arose from universities and represented postwar voices continued in the first half of the 1960s when scholars emphasized those magazines' impact "outside [of] the 'establishment'" (Schwab-Felisch 1965, 29). Considering the worldwide student movements around 1968, their emphasis on academic journals, which for them included student-run periodicals, seems justified. I will further discuss the importance of literary magazines that were associated with universities in the subsection "Functions of a Literary Magazine" below.

Yet the definition of what is (not) considered a literary magazine in the scholarly field continues to be problematic, if our goal is to assess what readership(s) they are intended to influence. Between the 1970s and 1990s, the literary magazine genre was defined more broadly than in the 1950s and 1960s and came to include regional cultural periodicals, entertainment magazines, as well as journals focusing on literary criticism (Fischer and Dietzel 1992, 19). However, I argue that such a diversity obscures the unique position of specific journals in forming public discussion, as well as the insistence on forming a future generation.

More contemporary classification attempts focus on the differences and similarities between cultural and literary magazines, which introduces another variable that seems only to exacerbate classification and audience problems. Whereas some scholars argue that a distinction between these two types is complicated because of fluid transitions between them (Schnell 2003, 43), others claim that literary magazines tend to be more specific, while cultural periodicals are broader in their contents (Holt 2009, 251). Even within the literary magazine genre, there seems to be a twofold distinction in

contemporary research. First, the so-called "Entdeckerzeitschriften" [discoverer magazines], which either reprint literary texts that have sunken into oblivion, or publish original printings and preprints (ibid.). And second, they identify as "Reflexionsorgane" [reflection platforms] magazines that focus on essays, reviews, and author portraits, as well as contemporary literary and cultural debates—magazines that contextualize cultural production (ibid.).

In practice, however, all of these classifications are at best, in my estimation, only somewhat helpful because one magazine rarely fits just one category. But taken together, the research on West Germany's "literary magazines" defines some key elements they all seem to entail and that need to be factored into future classifications. Literary magazines are (1) more or less overtly ideologically influenced (Paeschke 1951, 577); (2) they often include key subgenres such as essays, reviews, and criticism (Marigold 1956, 40); and they are (3) influenced mainly by literary, philosophical, critical, and political texts (Fischer and Dietzel 1992, 19; Holt 2009, 251; Laurien 1991, 64).

To define the genre as I move forward, I therefore ultimately agree with Schnell, who defines literary magazines as critical periodicals that reflect on everyday culture, cultural policies, political theory, cultural criticism, literary aesthetics, and, more generally speaking, social analyses, thus providing space for non-conformist and unconventional criticism (Schnell 2003, 43). The latter point starts the discussion of the functions of literary magazines, which is examined in the following sections. From here forward, I will rely on the fact that the very rubric "literary magazine" is a misnomer,

unless we understand "literature" in the German sense of *Schrifttum* or *Literatur*, a body of texts.

FUNCTIONS OF A LITERARY MAGAZINE

Although the work of identifying and documenting the FRG's postwar journals has largely been done, their precise function remains sketchy—it is unclear who actually read them and what "critique" actually implied. These literary magazines remain relatively under-researched with respect to their political agendas and how they perceived their own roles in achieving them, no matter how critical these texts may be for understanding cultural politics of the Cold War era. The literary magazines under consideration in this dissertation are not only critical periodicals, often including wide varieties of text types, they also serve differing functions under the rubric of "criticism." In general, defining the functions of literary magazines (as critique or otherwise) requires understanding *who* wrote for *whom*. In the immediate postwar period, those defining functions must also include an additional ideological layer: many periodicals in the FRG were issued by the Allies (actually published with their approval, in their zones, and often financed by them), and some scholars have argued that they therefore followed ideas of not only "Versöhnung und Völkerverständigung" [reconciliation and cultural diplomacy], but also "Re-education" after twelve years of Nazism (Eppelsheimer 1954, 231). Thus, their projected readership was potentially the entire FRG, because in the immediate postwar era, the Allied sponsors of such magazines defined them as mass media and assumed that "German" culture was a culture of readers who at that point would be eager to "catch up" on what they had been

denied for a decade—a historically justifiable assumption, if overly optimistic. Other scholars have challenged that claim by asserting that literary magazines supported the personal interest of the individual and groups who edited them rather than their sponsors (Haacke 1961, 13). That spectrum of assuming who was served by the immediate postwar era's literary magazines continues in the debate, but for the present purposes, the *presumption* that the Allies held at least some influence over the production and distribution of printed materials in general (they controlled paper availability, for instance) needs to be factored in.

Scholarship has been uneven in factoring the "occupation" and its aftermaths into narratives about the landscape of literary magazine production. To put it more bluntly, the scholarly landscape of West Germany's literary magazines has made different assertions regarding the relation between publisher and readership that all too often rest on accepting the cultural myth of the FRG's "Zero Hour" as "clearing the ground of history and enabling a fresh start" (Forner 2014, 8). Some scholars close to that Zero Hour straightforwardly claimed literary magazines as the "wahre Ausdrucks*mittel* des kleinen Mannes" [the common man's means of expression] (Pross 1963, 10). Others have challenged that class-bind argument by arguing that publishers of literary magazines were academic elites (Brelie-Lewien 1986, 9) and a "phenomenon of an intellectual and specialized society that has largely emancipated itself from the state" (Schwab-Felisch 1965, 26). Moreover, many scholars have suggested that all authors only had the possibility of publishing in journals *if* they were members of a "bürgerlichen Bildungskultur" [bourgeois educational culture], *if* they followed a certain regulatory system of intellectual exchange, and *if* they had no Nazi

past (Laurien 1991, iii–iv). Hence, the scholarship has different positions regarding the social status of postwar publishers and publications within what Schivelbusch (1998) has (tendentiously) claimed was a *Cold Crater*, and it seems that further work ought to be done to substantiate such claims.

The cases I am discussing are situated at the center of the spectrum. Without a doubt, as I have outlined in the first chapter, it certainly can be said that both *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* were founded by upper middle-class intellectuals and were published by financially sound and prestigious publishing houses. In that sense, they were conceived by a second postwar generation, because the factor of direct outside political influence was officially minimal—the publishers and editors sought to claim a space beyond the sponsored magazines (literary and cultural) that powers like the US and the USSR helped to spread across the globe during the Cold War. With regard to the two periodicals under investigation, then, the more controversial question lies on the side of their *consumption* rather than their production: whether and how literary magazines actually function, as opinion-forming or opinion-manipulating.

Taken together, the scholarship is not concordant about whether literary periodicals (like virtually all periodicals) actually create or reflect cultural opinions and debates. Some scholars have argued that literary magazines need to shape public opinion through asserting and embodying specific literary, philosophical, and cultural-political programs (Paeschke 1951, 576–7). Similarly, it has been suggested that it is the magazine's "natural obligation" to be the tool for enlightenment and "reasonable existence" (Haacke 1961, 13). These positions assert that literary magazines function in an opinion-forming and role-model-

creating fashion (Fröhner 1962, 86), and that it is the aspiration of the literary and academic intelligentsia to manipulate public thought through literary magazines (Fischer and Dietzel 1992, 10). Such assertions assume the power of elite culture over popular culture—a distinction that may have applied in the more limited publishing landscape of the immediate postwar years in the FRG (due to limited resources for "non-essential" publications during initial reconstruction), but was already questionable by the early 1960s.

In contrast, other approaches flip this magazine-readership relationship by understanding literary periodicals as a reflection of a society that "has steadily become ever more sharply conscious of itself" (Schwab-Felisch 1965, 26) and thus are driven by the audience as a historically situated class. Along the same lines, scholars suggest that rather than being an influencing factor themselves, literary magazines merely provide a stage for political opinions of self-defining groups (Laurien 1991, 42). Understanding periodicals as a platform for debate also emphasizes the genre's purportedly democratic force. It has been argued that, in that postwar era, these journals were presumably the only and certainly the most accessible entry for public debates from both a reader's and contributor's perspective (ibid., 44). The function of literary magazines therefore can be best summarized as being "Diskussionsforen gesellschaftlicher und ästhetischer Probleme" [discussion forums for societal and aesthetic problems] (Schnell 2003, 46).

There might be no scholarly agreement as to whether West Germany's literary magazines created or reflected opinions and debates. But especially in the context of the earlier mentioned political radicalizations of the 1960s and 1970s, these periodicals criticized elites and political systems, they embodied a demand for change, and they

reflected the voice of alternative movements, as I will show in the following sections. One must not forget that, in the evolving media landscape of the FRG, it was the independent print media that first had the ability to "liberate" themselves from official political control (albeit not necessarily from financial controls, or other indirect political forces).

It is also critical to remember that both *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* understood their functions in generational terms. As mentioned above, scholars from the 1950s had already highlighted the importance of student publications which "devote[d] a great deal of space to publishing the works of younger writers" (Marigold 1956, 42). Periodicals such *Die Wandlung* [The Changing] (published 1945–9) and *Der Ruf* [The Call] (published 1946–9) were "symbolical titles that indicated the break between generations" (Schwab-Felisch 1965, 28). These journals were remarkable in their eras since they perceived themselves, and presumably also were perceived by their readers, as instruments of protest and nonconformity, outside the "public" media landscape and its political pressures. As a precursor for the student movements around 1968, they "have been started – largely by students – outside the 'establishment,' and though small, they have become important centers of the opposition" (ibid., 29). These literary magazines were cast firmly as an outlet for young writers and publicists and "wanted to be the voice of this silent generation […] Young meant a radical distancing from what had gone before, in other words from the old political concepts and forces, which they held responsible for the Nazi dictatorship" (Böhringer 1977, 174–177).[1] Early periodicals such as *Der Ruf* were therefore important

[1] "Young" is an ambiguous term in the scholarship. Some define it within the age range from 20 to 35 years (Böhringer 1977, 87), while others denote "young" with a certain set of attitudes rather than age (Boterman 1994, 177).

as they claimed their roles of critiquing both the Allies and West Germans (Schnell 2003, 79). But these earlier postwar attempts to provide room for public debates were controlled and limited by the Allies and eventually caused their termination (Brelie-Lewien and Laurien 1983, 411). They did, however, set the stage for subsequent critical periodicals such as *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*.

In response to censorship by the Allies, the literary magazines between 1949 and 1962 had largely promoted a more politically "neutral" message. But then an improvement of the production conditions in the early 1960s through offset printing caused a rise of new literary magazines and a rejuvenation of publishers and readers because it was economically feasible to "go it alone" (Fischer and Dietzel 1992, 18). Furthermore, established magazines such as *Texte und Zeichen* [Texts and Signs] or *Akzente* [Accents] were by the 1960s not sufficient enough for filling aesthetic and political lacunas (Niese 2017, 60). Scholars thus connect the development of young and rebellious counter-movements directly to this latest upswing of literary magazines (J. K. King 1974, 61; Schwab-Felisch 1965, 29). These new journals turned back explicitly to the public debates and criticism that had been the focus of early postwar publications such as *Der Ruf* (that folded after only three years, in no small part because of the evolving political situation). This shift in publishing opportunities led to left-wing radicalization within literary magazines, which, most scholars agree, ultimately set the stage for West Germany's intellectual contributions to the world-wide student protests around 1968 (J. K. King 1974, 61).[2] More precisely, scholars agree that most political literary magazines since the 1960s

[2] However, wide-spread journals such as *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* were still published by major publishing houses, namely *Suhrkamp* and *Rowohlt*. Such publishers played a significant role in expanding

have had a significant impact on the FRG's student movement, which was motivated by the critical analysis of fascism, Marxism, and solidarity with the so-called Third World through the intellectual debates within these magazines (no few of which grew out of student publishing).

This story, however, only codifies the external story of these magazines. As stated above, it is unclear who actually read periodicals and what "critique" actually implied. To put it simply, these magazines remain relatively under-researched with respect to their political agendas and how they perceived their own roles in achieving them. This lack of attention to what roles the magazines actually played has often led scholars to generalizations and superficial assumptions, especially in terms of political agendas. As already stated in my dissertation introduction above, the scholarship has often wrongly portrayed the political Left in West Germany around 1968 as something coherent, a more or less one-sided treatment of a one-sided Marxism. The scholarship unjustifiably treats political literary magazines of the 1960s and 1970s in similarly limited terms, as *one* voice of *one* rebellious youth, following *one* coherent political agenda. Most scholarly assumptions on *Kursbuch* prove that point.[3]

In contrast, I argue that the FRG's literary magazines around 1968 reveal a multifaceted and disjointed Marxist Left. The next sections of this chapter will first analyze the editors' correspondence around the years of initial publication, to examine to what extent *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* not only embodied the just described genre literary

---

the left-literary sphere in West Germany, as they were quick to develop specialty imprints aimed at a left-student audience and, by doing so, were heavily involved in "helping to create the left publicistic sphere in West Germany" (Brown 2013, 146).

[3] See for instance Albrecht (1999, 221), Dirke (1997, 47), Heißenbüttel (1981, 45), or Marmulla (2007, 37).

magazine, but also how they both problematize any generalization on West Germany's postwar periodicals. After that, I will contextualize their discussion within broader, long-term Marxist discussions about how culture influences publics and politics.

KURSBUCH EMERGES

The editors' correspondence around the years of *Kursbuch*'s initial publication (June 1965) illustrate how Enzensberger's intellectual biography and ambitions were reflected in planning his magazine. Inspired by the plans for the never published *Revue Internationale*, Enzensberger envisioned his *Kursbuch* as a platform for a counter-public sphere that positioned itself against what he considered to be the prevailing, dominating, and opinion-manipulating public sphere (Marmulla 2011, 13).

How Enzensberger designed *Kursbuch* as such a tool for seizing control of the earlier described Consciousness Industry will bring me back to at least three hallmarks of his intellectual engagements prior to *Kursbuch* that I identified above: first, his twofold role in the West German intelligentsia (one of the antagonistic *angry young man* and an established public identity); second, his international intellectual engagement and global networks; and third, his dialectical understanding of literary praxis and social theory as what he considered necessary means for raising critical consciousness. My goal now is to document how these three features (among others) influenced *Kursbuch*'s planning phase, as important insights into and evidence for the journal's anticipated profile and intended audience within the FRG's leftist landscape.

Let me begin with Enzensberger's correspondence with Karl Markus Michel (1929–2000), who since 1961 had worked as an editor for *Suhrkamp Verlag*, before co-founding *Kursbuch* with Enzensberger and, starting in 1965, functioning as the magazine's co-editor. In a letter from July 1964, one year before the first *Kursbuch* issue was published, Enzensberger imagines the journal as follows:

> The magazine should be characterized by the refusal to accept ossified gestures, cadences, and attitudes such those that appear in established genres […] In Kursbuch, one should not only write something different, but first and foremost write differently, and free oneself from the reproduction of habits that have commonly lost their philosophical raison d'être.[4]

This quote illustrates how Germany's *angry young man* rejected the status quo of the cultural and literary landscape he faced in the 1960s, including the language of "Year Zero" emphasized by *Group 47*. Instead, he envisioned a *Umfunktionierung* [refunctioning] of authorship, the role of literature, and the intellectual's mandate (Marmulla 2011, 10).[5] To put it differently, instead of reproducing what Enzensberger

[4] Source: Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach, Bestandssignatur SUA:Suhrkamp, Brief von Hans Magnus Enzensberger an Karl Markus Michel vom 07.07.1964: "die zeitschrift sollte durch die weigerung charakterisiert sein, geronnene gesten, tonfälle, haltungen zu akzeptieren, wie sie in den etablierten gattungen zum vorschein kommen […] man sollte im kursbuch nicht nur etwas anderes, sondern vor allem anders schreiben, sich von der reproduktion solcher gewohnheiten befreien, denen die philosophische raison d'être meist längst abhandengekommen ist." From here on, I will cite letters from the Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach as follows: "SUA: letter from [addressor] to [addressee] from DD.MM.YYYY." I will continue to use the German date format because the correspondence is filed in this fashion at the Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach. Unless otherwise noted, all errors and variant spellings in the German original quotes are unedited (except for the use of single quotation marks for enclosing quotations within quotations). Unless otherwise noted, all English translations are my own.

[5] The idea of *Umfuntionierung* [refunctioning] goes back to Bertolt Brecht's (1898–1956) Marxist theater and was "designed to open up a new discourse about writer, text, and audience" (E. Wright 1989, 45).

considered the purposeless *old*, *Kursbuch* should help liberate their public's consciousness from outdated perspectives.

For Enzensberger and Michel, the most important tool for this emancipation was decisive social and cultural criticism. In his responding letter, Michel shared Enzensberger's aspirations and stated that *Kursbuch* should follow Walter Benjamin's demand "to restore criticism to its former strength" (2004a [1922], 293).[6] The magazine, Michel argues, must formulate a critique not in the sense of "an application of principles towards the objects of its investigations, but rather the search for criteria in the objects at hand themselves. In order to do that, new forms and distinct paths would have to be found."[7] Thus, the two *Kursbuch* editors envisioned a platform for new and non-dogmatic criticism in the cause of raising consciousness for a counter-public and therefore in contrast to the prevailing public discourses. They rejected what they considered old and established forms and strove for alternative methods of raising critical consciousness.

---

[6] Note that the German reads: "dem kritischen Wort seine Gewalt zurückzugewinnen." Which would highlight struggle more—"to win back power for critical utterances." This is one of many examples where the English translation takes liberties with the original. Interestingly enough, Michel quotes from Benjamin's "Announcement of the Journal *Angelus Novus*" (written in 1922, but unpublished during Benjamin's lifetime), a periodical that Benjamin planned but never published. Benjamin's goal for *Angelus Novus* was to solicit contributions from experts in such fields as politics, linguistics, philosophy, Judaism, and literary criticism, and to keep the journal's readers up-to-date on the most important developments in these fields (Dunn 2001, 1). The editorial board included Ernst Bloch (1885–1977) as the philosophy editor, Gershom Scholem (1897–1982) as the editor in charge of Judaic studies, and Benjamin himself as the authority on literary criticism (ibid.). Because of delays in production and soaring inflation, *Angelus Novus* had to be abandoned before the first issue appeared (ibid., 2).

[7] SUA: letter from Karl Markus Michel to Hans Magnus Enzensberger from 20.07.1964: "Andererseits scheint mir Benjamins Forderung [...] 'dem kritischen Wort seine Gewalt zurückzugewinnen', eher dringender geworden zu sein. Zwar sollte die Schwelle, zu deren Hüter Benjamin die Kritik bestellt, vor dem Kursbuch liegen, nicht in ihm. Da Kursbuch aber nicht ein Allerheiligstes sein soll, viel eher selbst ein Kritikon (wenn auch ohne lähmende Fixierung auf das Andere, Eingeschliffene), kann man wohl kaum eine explizit geübte literarische Kritik strikt ausschließen: ich wünschte sie mir compulsive; nicht Anwednung [*sic*] von Prinzipien auf Gegenstände, sondern Suche nach Kriterien am Gegenstand. Doch auch dafür müßten neue Formen, eigene Wege ermittelt werden."

Before I elucidate how they aimed to achieve such a critical consciousness-raising, let me single out one of the *Kursbuch*'s main objects of criticism: West Germany's *Literaturbetrieb* [literary business in all its forms].[8]

Enzensberger wrote in early 1965 that he was not interested in making a literary magazine for German literature and instead wanted a substantial amount of non-German contributors.[9] But it is worth mentioning that Enzensberger thought *Kursbuch* should not only include international perspectives as a counterweight to the FRG's *Literaturbetrieb*. In fact, he envisioned his periodical to be positioned *against* the German literary landscape currently in play (which would, remember, include *Group 47*).[10] One of his key criticisms of the FRG's literary scene was its predilection for *belles-lettres*, i.e. literature for literature's sake. Instead, *Kursbuch* was intended to be a literary magazine with political ambitions, as I will elucidate later in this chapter.[11] The first issues of *Kursbuch* were in fact directed against the status quo of West German literature, not against literature *per se*, even though the magazine's stance on literature itself changed with the development of the student movement. Enzensberger indeed considered

---

[8] *Literaturbetrieb* refers to the literature market's commercial mechanics, i.e. its economic aspects of production, distribution, and reception (Arnold and Beilein 2009, 9). See for instance Seybold and Chihara (2019) for a recent publication on the connection of literature and economics.

[9] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 17.02.1965: "den finnen und den polen möchte ich sogleich publizieren, das heft bekommt sonst ein zu großes übergewicht auf der seite der deutschen autoren. sichtbar machen, von anfang an, daß wir keine zeitschrift für national-literatur sind."

[10] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 19./20.09.1965: "die eselhaftigkeit des herrn werner bestärkt mich in der vermutung, daß eine zeitschrift wie die unsere nicht mit den deutschen belletristen, sondern gegen sie gemacht werden muß."

[11] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 12.03.1965: "zum andern möchte ich gern […] gleich im ersten der beiden hefte ganz unverhüllt politisch argumentieren."

literature in *Kursbuch*'s early stages a crucial complement for his consciousness-raising agenda, but by 1968, he devaluated literature as socially purposeless (1974a [1968], 92).

Methodologically, the reasoning for making a literary magazine with political ambitions rather than just a simply a political journal (or one dealing in *belles-lettres* alone) resulted from Enzensberger's conviction that purely theoretical and sociological tools were insufficient in explaining power relations in society.[12] To put it differently, Enzensberger considered both literary praxis and social theory equally important for seizing the Consciousness Industry and transforming it for a Marxist purpose. He wanted *Kursbuch* to approach each issue's topic moving from theory to praxis, starting off with essays that dealt with a topic in general, and then turning to essays that provided examples which specified each topic.[13] He also emphasized the importance of including original documents such as legal protocols, hearings, shorthand reports, etc., which typified again his intention to go beyond the limits of a purely literary magazine.[14] Enzensberger understood that, before consciousness can be transformed, its current conditions first have to be examined. Not surprisingly, he thus also wanted to include

---

[12] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 19./20.09.1965: "theoretisch, mit soziologischem 'rüstzeug', ist, glaube ich, der frage, wer uns regiert, überhaupt nicht beizukommen. die theorie sagt nur, und dies seit gut hundert jahren, was uns regiert: nicht wer dieses was leibhaftig darstellt."

[13] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 12.03.1965: "ich stelle mir das kursbuch 2 so vor: einige große aufsätze, welche die sache im ganzen überdenken, also etwa fanon, dobb, in gewisser hinsicht fuentes, und, wenn mir die arbeit gelingt, mein eigener beitrag. und zweitens: eine reihe von spezifikationen, die das ganze nun am beispiel vorführen und anwenden."

[14] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 07.07.1964: "ich überlege mir, ob wir nicht in der ersten nummer des kursbuchs ein dossier darüber vorlegen sollten. (ich wähle den ausdruck dossier, statt 'dokumentation', und meine damit was ich im brief angedeutet habe, prozeß-protokolle, hearings, stenogramme aller art, realitäts-stenogramme, gelegentlich eben auch polemiken, und zwar gebündelte. ein solches dossier sollte in jeder nummer stehen.)"

letters from readers published in popular magazines in order to "portray the status quo of the general consciousness."[15]

In terms of its content, *Kursbuch* was seeking to publish non-German contributions that were unknown in the country but—in the editor's opinions—relevant to the German public, international works on structuralist theory being one of many examples of the categories he chose.[16] This international emphasis also becomes clear in the magazine's thematic focal points that always went beyond the FRG's borders.[17]

Enzensberger's co-editor Michel concurred, describing *Kursbuch* as a series of special issues rather than an actual magazine. The topic of each periodical, he stated years later, was principally forced upon the editors by contemporary world events.[18] This topicality exemplifies the close connection of *Kursbuch* with the international historical context in which it evolved, politically and intellectually.[19] Taken together, *Kursbuch* in

---

[15] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 12.03.1965: "[…] dazu brächte ich gerne noch etwa fünf seiten mit deutschen leserbriefen zu dem problem des heftes, hauptsächlich aus dem spiegel. […] ich meine doch, man sollte den status quo des allgemeinen bewußtseins zeigen."

[16] SUA: letter from Karl Markus Michel to Hans Magnus Enzensberger from 14.10.1964: "Ein anderer Vorschlag für ein Dossier, vielleicht auch für einen theoretischen Aufsatz: Strukturalismus. […] In Deutschland ist 'Strukturalismus' bis heute noch ein leerer Begriff. Da gibt es viel nachzuholen."

[17] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 03.08.1965: "ich habe den eindruck, daß die deutsche diskussion über dies und verwandte themen äußerst zaghaft ist, sich übrigens meist auch auf vordergründige fragen abdrängen läßt […] das ist in skandinavien anders."

[18] SUA: letter from Karl Markus Michel to Friedrich Ege from 13.01.1968: "Das liegt nicht an Ihrer Arbeit, die ich ja gar nicht kenne, sondern an den besonderen Bedingungen und Zielen des Kursbuches, das ja weniger eine Zeitschrift als eine Serie von Sonderheften ist, die jeweils einem speziellen Thema gewidmet sind. Und die Themen drängen sich uns mehr oder weniger auf."

[19] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 07.07.1964: "ich lese eben einige nachrichten über die polemik, die sartre kürzlich in paris hervorgerufen hat. es handelt sich, wie sie wahrscheinlich wissen, um ein interview in le monde, gegeben im frühjahr. […] die bedeutung der polemik geht weit über die saison hinaus. es wird hier die fragwürdigkeit des 'engagements' zum ersten mal erbarmungslos dargestellt. das wird auch anfang '65 noch von interesse sein."

the early planning stages intended to be a "literary magazine" with a contemporaneous, international, political, and critical focus on writing in all its forms, not just literature.

In brief, the magazine's beginnings addressed its public with very particular key characteristics. First, Enzensberger and Michel situated themselves in an intellectual and historical moment: against the status quo of the West German literary field, against the notion of literature and art for the sake of literature and art, and in close communication with international world events and intellectual debates. Second, they planned to communicate their perspectives through a combination of different genres without emphasizing a specific category, including politically engaged literature, philosophy, and texts involving Marxist and other social theories. Third, the topics of *Kursbuch* were always international and contemporaneous. The goal was not to delight the readers, but to raise critical consciousness and to promote thinking beyond the FRG's intellectual borders. In this way, Enzensberger's literary background, his critical attitude towards this time period, and his international networks and perspectives shaped *Kursbuch*'s aims of being a critical, contemporaneous, and international tool targeting the manipulation of the Consciousness Industry. Having such a profile, it is therefore no surprise that many scholars retrospectively considered *Kursbuch* "the main public forum for the student movement" (Dirke 1997, 47).

Kursbuch's critical, sober, and purpose-driven approach was also reflected in debates concerning the journal's title. In 1964, one year before the first *Kursbuch* issue was published, the periodical's to-be-editor Enzensberger defended his choice of the magazine's title [*Kursbuch*, echoing a railroad schedule or route schedule] against the

advice of his literary editor at the *Suhrkamp Verlag*, Walter Boehlich (1921–2006). The latter suggested naming the journal *Einzelheiten* [details] or *Kursblatt* [market report].[20] But Enzensberger insisted on *Kursbuch* [route guide] because the title would imply "pleasantly dry and reliable" affinities while unveiling multiple connections without prescribing a single direction.[21] He therefore wanted his magazine to be as impartial and unbiased as possible. Moreover, Enzensberger defended his title by stating that a *Kursbuch* is not made for fast consumption, which he considered disadvantageous. Instead, he argued that a *Kursbuch* requires some knowledge and diligence from its readers—like a railway schedule, you have to learn how to read it in light of where you want to go. Additionally, the magazine's sober title reflects Enzensberger's valuation of politically engaged, "purpose-driven" content over literature for literature's sake, as noted above. One illustrative example of such preference for solid guidelines over *belles-lettres* is the poem "For a Sixth Form Reader," in which Enzensberger writes: "Don't read odes, my boy, read the timetables: / they are more exact" (2006 [1957], 84).[22]

The discussions about the magazine's design mirror Enzensberger's reasoning regarding the journal's title. He wanted, for example, a handwritten font for the

[20] SUA: letter from Walter Boehlich to Hans Magnus Enzensberger from 25.05.1964.
[21] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Walter Boehlich from 30.05.1964: "kursbücher dagegen zeigen feste verbindungen (und zwar eine große auswahl), schreiben keinen kurs vor, haben etwas angenehm trockenes und zuverlässiges, übrigens: wer sie lesen will, muß ein wenig kenntnis und sorgfalt investieren, das kann nicht schaden."
[22] English translation by David Constantine. Original German passage from Enzensberger's poem "ins lesebuch für die oberstufe": "lies keine oden, mein sohn, lies die fahrpläne: / sie sind genauer" (H. M. Enzensberger 1963 [1957], 85).

periodical's table of contents, one that reminds readers of "doodling on a notepad."[23] In keeping with his claim that one has to engage with the Consciousness Industry first in order to seize control of it, this rationale shows that Enzensberger wanted to invite the *Kursbuch* readers to be involved in the magazine, rather than establishing a top-down hierarchy with him or the author being the authority. This reversed hierarchical structure is also exemplified in Enzensberger's request that his name should not appear on the front page since he did not want to stand out.[24] Furthermore, the *Kursbuch* editor wanted to ensure accessibility and improve readability by avoiding "flatulent" and "academic" jargon, which is a stark contrast to the complex academic style of his Marxist contemporaries at that time.[25] Finally, Enzensberger wanted the readers to be able to distinguish each issue through different colors rather than using the binding to establish a single identity for the set of issues.[26] Niese argues that the rainbow-colored book spines ought to question the "grey" (i.e. dry and boring) theory of the time and, by doing so, spread interest in the "drug called theory" all over the FRG (2017, 36).

---

[23] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 07.07.1964: "das inhaltsverzeichnis denke ich mir nicht in satzschrift, sondern handschriftlich ähnlich wie man dinge auf einem telefonblock kritzelt oder aufzeichnet. die handschrift kann von nummer zu nummer wechseln."
[24] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 08.10.1964: "ich möchte meinen namen nicht auf dem titelblatt haben, oder doch nur in brotschrift, also ganz klein. wahrscheinlich wird man sich in dieser hinsicht [...] dagegen wehren müssen, plakatiert zu werden - das gilt auch für sie."
[25] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 17.02.1965: "schließlich gebe ich zu bedenken, ob es nicht besser wäre, die französischen zitate und termini soweit wie möglich zu übersetzen. Sie wirken im deutschen text blähend, akademisch; die versuchung (eine versuchung der präzision) verstehe ich sehr wohl, doch darf man nicht mit allzu beschlagenen lesern rechnen [...]"
[26] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 17.02.1965: "die hefte müssen von außen, und von weitem voneinander unterscheidbar sein. man kann meinetwegen ruhig farben verwenden."

Taken together, Enzensberger's reasoning about the title and design of *Kursbuch* provides insights about the readership he envisioned: a non-dogmatic and fairly knowledgeable audience willing to entertain change and challenge. And even though Niese suggests that *Kursbuch*'s readership cannot be generalized since it was read on a spectrum from liberal-bourgeois readers to the students of the New Left (ibid., 26), he suggests that the periodical fits into the general description of the literary magazine genre provided above. It indeed seemed to be a "phenomenon of an intellectual and specialized society that has largely emancipated itself from the state" (Schwab-Felisch 1965, 26).

LITERATURMAGAZIN EMERGES

After examining the logics that went into *Kursbuch*'s initial stages, I will now investigate *Literaturmagazin*'s planning phase, more specifically, its call for submissions, editorial correspondence, and discussions within the magazines' redaction boards. I already have outlined Hans Christoph Buch's intellectual profile before he became the founder of *Literaturmagazin*. The aim of this section is to scrutinize to what extent his positions, especially in terms of Marxist theory and literary praxis, are reflected in his journal's initial phase of development. I will again focus on the periodical's early planning phase because it provides important insights into the journal's anticipated profile as a response to its historical moment.

As I outlined above in "Buch's Path to *Literaturmagazin*," the journal's to-be-editor Hans Christoph Buch criticized in his publications prior to *Literaturmagazin* what he considered theoretical lacunas in Marxist theory and counterrevolutionary praxis in respect

to the West German student movement around 1968. To be more precise, he questioned the New Left's evaluation of literature as not being a socially and politically productive force, including the thesis on the *Death of Literature* mentioned earlier. Buch furthermore dismissed prevailing Western approaches to Marxism—e.g. the works of the Frankfurt School and French structuralists such as Roland Barthes—as well as dogmatic Marxist interpretations from the Eastern bloc states.

In contrast, Buch's proposed agenda embodied a non-dogmatic, historical, and partisan Marxism and the strong belief in literature as an emancipatory tool for critical consciousness-raising. Where Enzensberger stressed contemporaneous theories, Buch's theoretical foundation for his program distinguished itself by being mostly based on Marxist theorems published before 1945—Marxisms from the early twentieth century's sites of revolution and resistance. In fact, *Literaturmagazin*'s call for submissions reflects Buch's preferred definition of critique. Where Enzensberger stressed engagement with the present, *Literaturmagazin* can best be understood as having an additional dimension: an attempt to clean out what Buch considered faulty approaches to Marxist theory and literary praxis in the aftermath of "1968."

Buch founded *Literaturmagazin* with Jürgen Manthey (1932–2018). Since 1970, Manthey had been the literary editor at the *Rowohlt Verlag*, where he published Buch's already mentioned works *Kritische Wälder* (1972), *Parteilichkeit der Literatur oder Parteiliteratur* (1972), and *Lu Hsün: Der Einsturz der Lei-Feng-Pagode* (1973) in a book series called "das neue Buch" [the new book]. *Literaturmagazin*'s outward volume design was in accordance with all publications in this book series.

In the journal's first call for submissions in 1973, Buch and Manthey reached out to German and Austrian intellectuals from disciplines such as literature, history, philosophy, sociology, journalism, film, painting, theater, and broadcasting.[27] Similar to Enzensberger's line of reasoning in *Kursbuch*'s planning stage almost ten years earlier, Buch justified the need for a new magazine as a new counter-public medium based on West Germany's literary status quo (see this chapter's footnote 8). He argued that the "FRG's literature is in a desolate condition. A vacuum exists between the bourgeois literary scene and the well-intended but helpless literary politicization efforts [by the 68ers]."[28]

But despite this seemingly similar point of departure of *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*, Buch's approach to criticizing the FRG's literary landscape differs from Enzensberger's fundamentally in one respect. Whereas the *Kursbuch* founder points his criticism exclusively *against* the FRG's literary intelligentsia and as a result turns to non-

---

[27] Complete mailing list: Jürgen Alberts (1946–), Nicolas Born (1937–1979), Peter Otto Chotjewitz (1934–2010), Friedrich Christian Delius (1943–), Gisela Elsner (1937–92), Wolfgang Emmerich (1941–), Hubert Fichte (1935–1986), Rolf Haufs (1935–2013), Hans G. Helms (1932–2012), Günter Herburger (1932–2018), Elfriede Jelinek (1946–), Renke Korn (1938–), Hartmut Lange (1937–), Gert Loschütz (1946–), Oskar Negt (1934–), Hermann Peter Piwitt (1935–), Peter Rühmkorf (1929–2008), Michael Scharang (1941–), Michael Schneider (1943–), Peter Schneider (1940–), Erasmus Schöfer (1931–), Wolfram Schütte (1939–), Klaus Stiller (1941–), Guntram Vesper (1941–) and Hans-Günter Wallraff (1942–). Source: Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach, Bestandssignatur: A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* von Hans Christoph Buch und Jürgen Manthey vom 14.02.1973. From here on, I will cite letters from the Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach as follows: "A:Rowohlt-Verlag: [correspondence title] from [addressor] from DD.MM.YYYY." I will continue to use the German date format because the correspondence is filed in this fashion at the Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach. Unless otherwise noted, all errors and variant spellings in the German original quotes are unedited (except for the use of single quotation marks for enclosing quotations within quotations). Unless otherwise noted, all English translations are my own.

[28] Ibid.: "Die Literatur in der BRD befindet sich in einem desolaten Zustand. Zwischen dem bürgerlichen Literaturbetrieb einerseits [...] und den ebenso gutgemeinten wie hilflosen Versuchen einer 'Politisierung' andererseits klafft ein Vakuum." Unless otherwise noted, all errors and variant spellings in the German original quotes are unedited (except for the use of single quotation marks for enclosing quotations within quotations). Unless otherwise noted, all English translations are my own.

German contributors, Buch's criticism, in contrast, is directed inclusively *towards* the intellectual elites. In fact, ten addressees of the journal's first call for submissions (who were not mentioned in the call) were attendees of the prestigious *Group 47* meetings (Born, Delius, Elsner, Fichte, Haufs, Herburger, Loschütz, Piwitt, Rühmkorf, and Vesper) and therefore active parts of Buch's criticized literary establishment.[29]

However, Buch considers the literary intelligentsia's approach to literature as just one reason for the FRG's desolate literary status quo. The quote above makes clear that, similar to his works prior to *Literaturmagazin*, he also continues to refuse attempts to politicize literature, i.e. the kind of literature demanded by Enzensberger in *Kursbuch* #15 supporting the "political alphabetization of Germany" (1974a [1968], 93). In contrast, Buch contends that

> The sense of literature's possibilities and functions has been buried in the rubble, as has that of art in general: this applies to both the bourgeois avant-garde as well as "leftist" literati, who are noteworthy by their remarkable unawareness of Marxist theory, especially in terms of aesthetics – a membership in the DKP [German Communist Party] functions here as a mechanical substitution for individual theoretical and practical work.[30]

[29] In 1963, Buch himself attended one *Group 47* meeting at the age of nineteen.

[30] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* from Hans Christoph Buch and Jürgen Manthey from 14.02.1973: "Der Sinn für Möglichkeiten und Aufgaben der Literatur, ja der Kunst überhaupt, ist verschüttet: bei der bürgerlichen Avantgarde [...] ebenso wie bei den 'linken' Literaten, die sich durch eine bemerkenswerte Unkenntnis der marxistischen Theorie, gerade auf dem Gebiet der Ästhetik, auszeichnen – die Mitgliedschaft in der DKP wird zum mechanischen Ersatz für die eigene theoretische und praktische Arbeit."

Just as in Buch's publications before *Literaturmagazin* mentioned earlier in this chapter, he vilifies politically engaged literature (as demanded by Enzensberger) as a result of superficial knowledge of the range and impact of Marxist theories: "The atmosphere needs to be cleansed from all (left- and right-wing) forms of Obscurantism and Opportunism, from the clerical power that governs today's Marxist thought, and from the bourgeois feuilleton mafia."[31] In other words, Buch argues that both the New Left and the established literary intelligentsia are to blame for the "desolate condition" of West German literature and that both literary approaches need to be overcome.

The dissatisfaction about literary praxis and Marxist theories in the aftermath of "1968" explains Buch's ambitions for creating a new literary magazine, and I will add greater context to that dissatisfaction in subsequent sections of this discussion. For him, all of West Germany's literary magazines are either a reflection of New Left, superficial knowledge of Marxism and/or the reproduction of bourgeois elitism. He attacks in *Literaturmagazin*'s first call for submissions other well-known periodicals directly by stating that "On its long march through the institutions, *Kursbuch* got stuck somewhere between Wittenau and North Korea, and *Akzente* keeps chitchatting in the style of *Group 47* as if nothing had happened."[32] To put it differently, West Germany's arguably most visible literary magazines of the early 1970s represent for Buch the two main trends of

---

[31] Ibid.: "[...] die Atmosphäre muß gereinigt werden von allen (rechten und linken) Spielarten des Obskurantismus und Opportunismus, von dem Pfaffentum, das heute die marxistische Lehre verwaltet, ebenso wie von der bürgerlichen Feuilletonmafia."

[32] Ibid.: "[...] das 'Kursbuch' ist auf seinem langen Marsch durch die Institutionen irgendwo zwischen Wittenau und Nordkorea steckengeblieben, und die 'Akzente' plaudern weiter im Stil der Gruppe 47, als sei nichts geschehen."

the FRG's Left after "1968": either unreflective Marxism (e.g. *Kursbuch*) or bourgeois ideology (e.g. *Akzente*).

The *Literaturmagazin* founder thus recognized an empty space within this dichotomy, which he meant to fill with his own periodical. Buch aimed for nothing less than a new kind of literature—not just a consciousness-raising encounter between text and readers, but the creation of new forms of literature that would realign the very functions of literary magazines in ways not accounted for in the traditional scholarly approaches I sketched earlier. In order to establish this new kind of literature, he wanted all contributors of *Literaturmagazin* to take "criticism and theory back into their own hands" instead of "accepting the moronic division of literary production and reception."[33] While admitting that there cannot be *one* coherent program for the magazine, he set the periodical's methodological parameters as follows:

> There cannot be a common thread; but all contributors should agree in their rejection of the current literary misery, in their assessment of art and literature as important socially productive forces that enable emancipatory fantasy (both individually and in the collective body), and in their binding to the progressive traditions of both bourgeois aesthetics as well as Marxist theoretical consciousness. The magazine's first issue should begin with a critique of literary criticism.[34]

---

[33] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* from Hans Christoph Buch and Jürgen Manthey from 14.02.1973: "[...] anstatt die schwachsinnige Arbeitsteilung zwischen Literaturproduktion und Rezeption zu akzeptieren, müssen sie [Autoren] [...] Kritik und Theorie wieder selbst in die Hand nehmen. Nur so kann eine neue Literatur entstehen."

[34] Ibid.: "Ein gemeinsames Programm kann es noch nicht geben; die Mitarbeiter sollten sich jedoch einig sein in ihrer Ablehnung der gegenwärtigen Literaturmisere, in ihrer Einschätzung von Kunst und Literatur

Taken together, the journal's first call for submissions sets therefore at least three conditions for potential contributors: first, they should be against the contemporaneous literary scene, including the bourgeois ideology of *Group 47* and the New Left's political conventionalism. Second, contributors need to acknowledge that art and literature have productive social and political functions, not just oppositional ones. And finally, submissions need to be theoretically grounded in both bourgeois aesthetics and Marxism, since both are part of what we today would call the horizon of expectation of the readers—to have a broad readership, the magazine must use a broad cultural basis to exert critique that actually can raise consciousness.

This theoretical bias will become more defined in the magazine's subsequent planning stages. Three months after the first call for submissions, yet before the publication of *Literaturmagazin*'s first issue, Buch and Manthey intensified their theoretical profile in a second call for submissions for the periodical's second issue:

> Lessons can be learned not only from the proletarian-revolutionary literature of the 1920s and 1930s, but also from the revolutionary bourgeoisie of the 18th and early 19th centuries, which first and foremost realized its claim for political leadership within the cultural superstructure.[35]

---

als einer wichtigen gesellschaftlichen Produktivkraft zur Freisetzung emanzipatorischer Phantasie (im einzelnen ebenso wie im Kollektiv), sowie in ihrer Anknüpfung an die fortschrittlichen Traditionen der bürgerlichen Ästhetik und an das theoretische Bewußtsein des Marxismus. Das erste Heft soll mit einer Kritik der Literaturkritik beginnen."

[35] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin" (2)* from Hans Christoph Buch and Jürgen Manthey from 24.05.1973.: "Zu lernen gibt es nicht nur in der proletarisch-revolutionären Literatur der 20er und 30er Jahre, sondern ebenso beim revolutionären Bürgertum des 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhunderts, das seinen politischen Führungsanspruch zunächst im kulturellen Überbau verwirklichte."

The quote above again exemplifies Buch's theoretical starting point for the practical "fight against the bourgeois literary establishment, with its established writers and critics, its bestseller lists and feuilleton reviews, which taken together prevent the actual progress of literature."[36] True to his fondness for pre-1945 Marxist theoreticians such as Walter Benjamin, Buch defines the task of *Literaturmagazin* as follows:

> [I]t [*Literaturmagazin*] perceives itself as a forum or workshop, in which new authors have the opportunity to present their texts and to exchange their goals and methods with more experienced colleagues. The writers are not just the producers, they are also *Literaturmagazin*'s most important target readership, since it is only through their help that it is possible to elevate the literary work to a higher standard and to reach broader readerships. "An author who teaches writers nothing, teaches no one" (Walter Benjamin). […] In terms of the target readership, we of course follow the Benjaminian notion that aims to sublate the traditional division of reader and author in its definition.[37]

To put it simply, *Literaturmagazin* aims to create a new literature by creating new writers, whose works should target a broad readership in order to make literature's

---

[36] Ibid.: "Kampf gegen den bürgerlichen Literaturbetrieb mit seinen Großschriftstellern und Großkritikern, seinen Bestsellerlisten und Feuilletonrezensionen, die einen wirklichen Fortschritt der Literatur verhindern."

[37] Ibid.: "Das ist zugleich die Hauptfunktion der geplanten Zeitschrift: sie betrachtet sich als Forum oder Werkstatt, in der neuen Autoren Gelegenheit gegeben werden soll, ihre Texte vorzustellen und sich mit erfahrenen Kollegen über Ziele und Methoden ihrer Arbeit zu verständigen. Die Schriftsteller sind nicht nur die Produzenten, sondern auch die wichtigste Zielgruppe des 'Literaturmagazins', denn nur mit ihrer Hilfe ist es möglich, das Niveau der literarischen Arbeit zu heben und breitere Leserschichten zu erreichen. 'Ein Autor, der die Schriftsteller nichts lehrt, lehrt niemanden' (Walter Benjamin). [...] Auch in dem, was hier als neue Zielgruppe genannt wird, folgen wir natürlich der Benjaminschen Auffassung, die die herkömmliche Trennung von Leser und Autor in der Definition aufzuheben sucht." The Benjamin quote is originally from his essay "The Author as Producer" (1982 [1937], 265).

socially productive function possible, i.e. the enabling of *emancipatory fantasies*, to use Buch's own terms. In other words, there can be no transformation of consciousness through literature if the forms in which transformative critique are presented are those laden with past ideologies instead of appealing to new forms of expression.

This requirement also explains Buch's stress on amalgamating theory and practice, if the new generation of writers is actually assumed to be addressing a new present on its own terms. Thus methodologically, "it would be desirable to demonstrate the use of historical methods on practical examples in order to sublate the mechanical division of literary theory and praxis."[38] The planning of *Literaturmagazin*'s second issue illustrates how Buch aimed to put this sublation into actual praxis.

In *Literaturmagazin*'s second issue, entitled *Von Goethe lernen?: Fragen der Klassikrezeption* [Learning from Goethe?: Questions on the Reception of {Weimar} Classicism] (1974), Buch aims to sublate literary theory and praxis using as a case study the West German postwar reception of German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832) on occasion of his 225th birthday in 1974. Buch criticizes what he considers an undialectical literary reception of Goethe from both the New Left and the literary establishment. To be more precise, both camps, according to the *Literaturmagazin* founder, have failed to produce a deliberate Marxist analysis of Goethe's legacy, failed to confront this legacy in production fashion:

---

[38] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief an Autoren und Mitarbeiter des LITERATURMAGAZINS (2)* from Hans Christoph Buch from December 1973: "[...] es wäre jedoch wünschenswert, um die mechanische Trennung von literarischer Theorie und Praxis aufzuheben, den Umgang mit historischen Modellen auch an praktischen Beispielen vorzuführen."

> The bourgeois Goethe cult that has long outlived itself has been replaced by a radical left-wing scorn for Goethe, "unmasking" him as a reactionary court flunky ~~(e.g. Martin Walser, Peter Weiss et al.)~~. But it is not the task of materialist analysis to label Goethe either as a reactionary or a revolutionary, but rather to dialectically render visible the compromises he made in relation to his historical accomplishments.[39]

Such a statement again exemplifies Buch's disappointment with his literary and Marxist contemporaries and highlights his intentions to publish a new kind of magazine. In aiming to fill this vacuum and overcome the dichotomy created by New Left critics who simply opposed the bourgeois intelligentsia, he suggests that "it is not about a historical overcoming of the past, but rather about a collaboration between contemporary authors along with progressive literary scholars, who demonstrate concretely what can (or cannot) be learned from the past."[40]

In this sense, *Literaturmagazin*'s early planning stages mirror and continue the literary and cultural criticism of its editor's earlier publications. Buch objects to what he considers left-wing dogmatism on the part of the 68ers (and their journals, explicitly *Kursbuch*) as much as he dismisses the established literary scene's bourgeois ideology

---

[39] Ibid.: "An die Stelle des bürgerlichen Goethekults, der sich längst überlebt hat, ist die linksradikale Verachtung Goethes getreten, der als reaktionäre Hofschranze 'entlarvt' wird ~~(bei Martin Walser, Peter Weiss u.a.)~~. Aufgabe der materialistischen Analyse ist es jedoch nicht, Goethe zum Reaktionär oder Revolutionär zu stempeln, sondern vielmehr, dialektisch seine Kompromisse im Verhältnis zu seiner historischen Leistung sichtbar zu machen." The strikethrough text is represented as it is in the original document.

[40] Ibid.: "Dabei geht es nicht um historisierende Vergangenheitsbewältigung, sondern darum, daß zeitgenössische Autoren, zusammen mit progressiven Literaturwissenschaftlern, konkret vorführen, was aus der Vergangenheit zu lernen ist (und was nicht)."

(exemplified by *Akzente* and its alignment with *Group 47*). Both literary engagements, he argues, do not do justice to the potential social and political function of literature in the contemporary age. Instead, Buch envisions *Literaturmagazin* as a forum that can function as a recovery project in which a dialectic of pre-1945 Marxist theory and bourgeois aesthetics are used to model and then create new kinds of literature for the new age. His insisting on a reversion to Marxist theory from before the end of World War II is grounded in the assertion that the West German and international Left after 1945 simply misinterpret Marxism. In consequence, the purpose of a forum like *Literaturmagazin* would be to recover the theoretical critical potential in older theories of how texts can influence consciousness—a transformed understanding of theory and praxis.

SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

As their programmatic statements indicate, Enzensberger's *Kursbuch* and Buch's *Literaturmagazin* were two separate attempts to create a counter-public against the FRG's prevailing literary, political, and cultural status quo. Their distinctiveness, however, seems initially surprising, considering that both journals started on the same premise (the rejection of West Germany's literary scene) and that both projects were inspired by Marxism. However, this distinctiveness should not be surprising at all, first in terms of the two authors' positions within Europe's post-1968 generation, and then—the aim for chapter 3 that follows—in light of their inherited theories of Marxist aesthetics.

The generational issue is only an entry point to the larger question of how they deployed Marxist critiques of the increasingly capitalist West and its roots in World War

II. Enzensberger and Buch might be from two different generations in the postwar FRG, but they do share a lot of similarities: both are trained literary scholars, both have lived abroad before their magazines' initial publication, and both were—intellectually, to say the least—involved in the student movements around 1968. Both saw the need for a new literary magazine grounded in their dissatisfaction about the West German literary scene, which inspired both to establish a counter-public against the status quo through *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*. Both tried to refunction the writer's and intellectual's role in society.

Despite all these similarities, however, their practical implementations differ heavily from each other. I argue here and in what follows that this mostly has to do with two varying interpretations of traditional Marxist theory adapted to how Enzensberger and Buch diagnosed the German situation of the day with respect to two issues: the position of the leftist intellectual and the means through which the public sphere might be influenced and a new form of class consciousness created.

Enzensberger's explicit ambition is very much framed in terms of traditional Marxist critique: he intended to seize control of the Consciousness Industry (the mass media) through cultural and societal criticism. In *Kursbuch*, in consequence, he wanted intellectuals to create critical consciousness and reveal power relations and manipulation in society through literary praxis and social theory. In the journal's early stages, literature served as a tool for truth-seeking and a necessary complement to theory. As we shall see in the upcoming chapter 3, *Kursbuch*'s "ethical" and "well-intentioned" guidance follows the Marxist aesthetic tradition that is best described with reference to the *Realism-Modernism Debate*, which aims to raise critical consciousness through a guided, decisive,

and cognitive process (*Kursbuch* = German for railway schedule). At the peak of the student movement, this goal of explicit consciousness-raising will ultimately lead Enzensberger to question the role of literature at all.

Methodologically, *Kursbuch* wanted to include mostly international social theory applied to contemporaneous problems.[41] *Kursbuch*'s Marxist agenda aimed for an emancipation of what Enzensberger considered the mere reproduction of the *old*, i.e. "ossified gestures, cadences, and attitudes such those that appear in established genres."[42] By doing so, the magazine hit the student movement's *zeitgeist* of looking for a new voice, a new consciousness for a generation rejecting Europe's fascist and capitalist heritages. As mentioned earlier, the periodical understood itself as *the* organ of the FRG's New Left (J. K. King 1974, 69), and scholars have retrospectively cast it as a "Sprachrohr" [mouthpiece] of a younger and oppositional generation (Heißenbüttel 1981, 45), as an implementation of Critical Theory (Albrecht 1999, 221), as "the main public forum for the student movement" (Dirke 1997, 47), and as an active contribution to the formation and mobilization of the German student movement (Marmulla 2007, 37).[43]

Literaturmagazin differs from *Kursbuch* in its founder's intellectual profile, its methodology, aims, and of course its different historical moment. Buch's journal was an

---

[41] *Kursbuch*'s topicality becomes clear in the fact that Enzensberger published about four issues each year, whereas *Literaturmagazin* published between 1973 and 1974 one magazine annually. Starting in 1975, *Literaturmagazin* was published biannually up until the 1980s, with the exception of only one publication in 1978 (issue 9).

[42] See this chapter's footnote 4.

[43] *Kursbuch*'s rising popularity and significance becomes clear in its circulation increase. The magazine began in 1965 with a circulation of 10,000 copies (J. K. King 1974, 69). By 1973, the founding year of *Literaturmagazin*, its circulation was 45,000 copies, with reprints and a total circulation of up to 80,000 copies per issue (ibid.).

aftershock of "1968," which he, as I have shown, considered from the beginning as counterrevolutionary. For Buch, the 1968ers, including Enzensberger, lacked both revolutionary-historical momentum and sufficient Marxist theory, especially in terms of literary critique. Instead of understanding literature as a consciousness-raising complement to social theory (Enzensberger) or as a way to simply unveil the world's misery (Adorno), Buch insisted that literature is a socially productive force. For him, utopian literature rather than theoretical analysis would emancipate consciousness. In contrast to the *realist* approach of consciousness-raising, exemplified by *Kursbuch*, then, Buch believed that individual experience rather than external cognitive guidance would be necessary to transform consciousness. Buch's understanding of Marxist aesthetics therefore fundamentally differed from Enzensberger and situates *Literaturmagazin* in a different tradition of Marxist aesthetics, as I will show in chapter 3. Instead of burying the *old* and focusing on international and contemporaneous theories, *Literaturmagazin* wanted to rediscover and recapture the power both of bourgeois aesthetics and pre-1945 Marxisms. The journal's planning stage reveals that, rather than dismissing the past, Buch wanted to use a non-dogmatic, historical, and partisan Marxist analysis to create a new kind of literature. Instead of replacing the West German literary intelligentsia with international voices, he wanted the establishment to collaborate with new writers in order to attain literature's social purpose for and by means of the German public.

Ultimately, I have suggested and will argue in the next chapters that the differing approaches found in both magazines are not only crucial for understanding "1968" as an intellectual event, but also for grasping West Germany's postwar intellectual history in

general. A comparison of both journals illustrates the complex landscape of Marxist thought. *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* not only capture the rise and aftermath of the international student movement, they also exemplify a paradigm shift in West Germany's postwar Marxist debates. Through their embodiments of multiple legacies of "1968" and the relevance of Marxist thought in the twenty-first century, both magazines hold within themselves their own *realist* dialectic. As Adorno rightly pointed out: "Dialectics is the quest to see the new in the old instead of just the old in the new" (1982a [1956], 38).

To back up this assertion, I have shown to this point how *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* situated themselves as activist, deploying Marxist-derived tactics of resistance against prevailing FRG cultural politics and with the goal of creating a literary counter-public sphere. They did so, however, in related but not identical approaches to consciousness transformation. Enzensberger and Buch both wanted to raise critical consciousness in their journals but chose two different paths on *how* to do that. This, I argue, has to do with their definitions of consciousness-raising and what they were raising consciousness about, not just with their shared vision of an editor as an engaged intellectual. Those magazines' two differing paths, as we shall see, represent two different ongoing debates associated with international and German Marxisms alike: traditional Marxist oppositionality, implementing dialectics within more or less realist points of view (*Kursbuch*), as opposed to a strategy aiming at a radical transformation of cultural productions through completely new forms (*Literaturmagazin*). Both agreed on the need for some medium to reach their public sphere, and on the inability of the FRG's existing media to fill that need.

These insights bring us back to the functions of literary magazines and debates of how a new transformation of culture in the postwar era could be effected—and to the question of how and why the literary magazine became Enzensberger's and Buch's medium of choice. To today's eyes, literary magazines are elite, if not elitist, cultural products, but the intensity of the arguments used by Enzensberger and Buch suggest that they felt it legitimate to use these publications to address the FRG public.

To elucidate what intellectual debates led to that choice and how their aesthetics need to be understood within the wider scope of Marxist intellectual history, then, we must turn towards the details of Marxist theory that allowed both authors to take consciousness-raising as a key goal for their aesthetic programs. It is, of course, beyond the scope of this dissertation to provide an exhaustive overview of the range and diversity of the Marxist aesthetics and the Marxist art projects that, historically, have attempted to function precisely in those terms for their culture.

I will therefore focus on what I consider the most relevant twentieth-century debates on aesthetics that are relevant for this dissertation: the *Realism-Modernism Debate* of the early twentieth century, its implementations for the so-called "Western Marxist" tradition, its alteration in *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*, and, finally, its contemporary spin-offs and relevance. These debates/programs, I argue, echo throughout European leftist and oppositional thought far beyond party Marxisms, and they will help explain the forms that the two consciousness-raising journals took and the roles they hoped to play.

Chapter 3: The Politics of Culture in a Broken Political Culture

In chapter 2, I have discussed (potential) social functions of literary magazines, and I have argued that *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* differed not just in their historical moment, but also in the kind of intervention they were hoping to make against the FRG's prevailing literary, political, and cultural status quo. In this chapter, I examine *how* the magazines' editors thought such an intervention would be possible through their magazines. Such an analysis requires situating the magazines within aesthetic theories of consciousness-raising. To set the stage for that analysis, I shall briefly review West Germany's postwar literary and cultural landscape, in order to illustrate the status quo against which *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* were revolting.

Recall, as I outlined in chapter 2, above, that early postwar literary magazines such as *Der Ruf* [The Call] were remarkable in their eras since they fashioned themselves, and presumably also were perceived by their readers, as instruments of protest and nonconformity, outside the "public" media landscape and its political pressures. After the magazines' termination through the Allies (1949), an editorial meeting was planned by Hans Werner Richter (1908–93) for a successor magazine, *Der*

Skorpion [The Scorpion], that would take their non-conforming identities into a new generation. *Der Skorpion* was never published, but those discussions eventually led to the formation of a different kind of intervention into the public sphere for culture: *Group 47*, later known as the "Inbegriff der deutschen Nationalliteratur" [paragon of West German national literature] (Gilcher-Holtey 2004, 208). *Group 47* would solidify an image of representing German culture under resistance to both Nazism and Allied intervention. Yet those claims, starting in the 1960s, became problematic for West Germany's radicalized leftists.

In today's received view of that new intervention into public culture, *Group 47*'s "critical intellectuals" acted as "custodians of democracy" in the young FRG, a process of transmission in which older actors served as conduits for oppositional thinking through the 1950s and beyond (Forner 2014, 324). But as younger cohorts radicalized throughout the 1960s, *Group 47*, like the Frankfurt School, found itself "outflanked on the left and even ridiculed as conformist by younger figures whose critical imaginations their work had helped fire" (ibid.). Positions held by *Group 47* associates such as Günter Grass, e.g. a commitment to parliamentary democracy (he supported the SPD in election cycles), were seen by younger and more radicalized students as "behind the times," and so the group actually became an "object of hostility" to a second post-war generation (Thomas and Bullivant 1974, 36). In October 1967, students demonstrated outside a *Group 47* meeting, accusing its associates of being powerless "paper tigers," suggesting they were lacking power in political action (Gilcher-Holtey 2004, 207). *Kursbuch* co-founder Karl Markus Michel even went beyond that accusation by dismissing *Group 47* "as 'not even a

paper tiger, just a lap-dog', making no political contribution and [being] unhelpful to the students' movement" and their system-challenging agenda (Thomas and Bullivant 1974, 86).

Other symbolic moments of *Group 47*'s imminent disintegration were, for example, Peter Handke's attack at the group's meeting in Princeton in 1966 (Roberts 1989, xiv), and Ulrike Meinhof's assertion that some of the decisive political developments (e.g. the Emergency Laws already mentioned, the FRG joining NATO, the Vietnam War, etc.) had "left absolutely no trace on the character of the group and the style of its work," illustrating its "complicity with the ruling class" (quoted in Thomas and Bullivant 1974, 37).[1]

In addition, explicit Marxist critique of the group and West Germany's literary scene in general came from Marxist literary scholars such as Hans Mayer (1907–2001), who argued that the group's "criticism" degenerated into market expertise (ibid.). Leftist circles also disapproved of *Group 47* for their seemingly too exclusive and uncritical preoccupation with literature as *belles-lettres* (ibid., 86). In contrast to the notion of art for art's sake, large parts of West Germany's younger generation rejected the very notion idea of a spiritual dimension to art that transcended the political as a position associated with bourgeois culture, eventually making them open to sociologically oriented attitudes and to the growing influence of more activist leftists like Herbert Marcuse (ibid., 37). In

[1] Original German quote: "Daß die Gründung der Bundesrepublik, der Eintritt der Bundesrepublik in die Nato, das KPD-Verbot, die atomare Aufrüstung, die Vorbereitung des Notstands, die Pressekonzentration bei Springer und der Vietnam-Krieg am Charakter der Gruppe, ihrem Tagungs- und Arbeitsstil spurlos vorübergegangen sind, gibt Richters politischen Intentionen metaphysischen Charakter, entlarvt sie als Komplicenschaft [*sic*] mit den Herrschenden" (Meinhof 1967, 3).

line with Marcuse's claim that "contemporary industrial society tends to be totalitarian" (2007 [1964], 5), new desires for radical change, as seen for example in Enzensberger's *Einzelheiten* (1962), led to calls for new writing styles and themes, creating a literature that aimed to "show that that the freedoms and tolerance of the pluralistic society were illusory" (Thomas and Bullivant 1974, 37). In this sense, *Kursbuch*, rather than *Group 47,* symbolized the *zeitgeist* of the revolutionary 1960s, where "commitment and literary realism increasingly came to be identified with political engagement" (Roberts 1989, xv), a "conquest of reality and a weapon in cognitive struggle" (Jameson 2012, 476).

The discussions summarized in the prior chapters were the *Kursbuch* editors' response to formulating what kinds of discussion the intellectuals called for in order to meet such public calls for a new space for public discussion. The present chapter will turn specifically to the second part of that debate: to the literature and other writings that were to implement these newer programs of public engagement via literary magazines, in contradistinction to the *Group 47*'s engagement in more traditional aesthetics.

This tracing of how a new implementation of literature in the public sphere was to be shaped is critical, because here, the Marxist legacies within German culture emerge in another way, in the question of the relation of aesthetics to consciousness, defined on the left as consciousness-raising (often in the tradition of Bertolt Brecht's *Verfremdungseffekt* [estrangement effect] and later adaptation of that point), and on the right, as *Bildung* [self-cultivation], the traditional description of bourgeois individuals coming into their own through engagement with culture. For the most part, the latter is reflected in the *Group 47* agenda of "clearing the ground of history and enabling a fresh start" by

embracing the myth of a "zero hour" that would allow for the recovery of the German culture that Nazism had destroyed (Forner 2014, 8). That agenda also defined the path to reinvigorating democracy as leading through the *Bildungsbürgertum* [educated class] focusing on *belles-lettres* and other art forms—a strategy of engagement that did not meet the demands of the younger West German leftists.[2]

As I have shown in chapter 2, one consequence of refusing that scheme of bourgeois art was that both *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* rejected the culture industries of the FRG's literary scene, including *Group 47*—the establishment of book reviews, book fairs, and traditional marketing schemes. It is reasonable to assume that, as their challenge to the goals of *Group 47*, *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* saw the need to restore German *consciousness*, not just German literature and art. Marxist critics over a century would have stressed that an oppressed class that hoped to be the bearer of history into a new era needed consciousness-raising, not just restoration of its values. In this lies the left's rejection of the established literary scene's bourgeois ideology.

As I will elucidate in what follows, both *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* evaluated literature in ways closely linked to Marxist literary criticism, which indicates that for the magazines' editors, literature was to serve more than just art for art's sake or for *Bildung* and the recovery of a mythical German spirit. Enzensberger and Buch understood that, while literature may be part of an ideological superstructure, it always has the potential to be more than merely a passive reflection of the economic base (Eagleton 1976, 4). As many Western Marxists would argue, art can't *in itself* change the course of history, but it can be

[2] See Richter (1962) for *Group 47*'s self-proclaimed intentions.

an active element in such change (ibid., 5)—it can do more than *reproduce* consciousness, it can facilitate the *production* of new consciousness. In order to further explain what is meant by such rather vague claims, I will outline which aspects of Marxist aesthetics in the German tradition I consider to have been important for understanding the two magazines under investigation and their eventual programs of writing. I argue that both journals were working in traditions of Marxist aesthetics long-standing in Germany.

But before I turn to the aesthetic theories and historical debates that are crucial for situating the Marxist legacies found in *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*, let me clarify why an excursion into the chronicle of Marxist literary history helps to understand both the journals under investigation as well as "1968" as an intellectual event.

ABSTRACT MATERIALITY OR MATERIAL ABSTRACTION? THE REVEALING *ZEITGEIST* OF THEORY

As mentioned earlier, *Kursbuch*—like other 1960s journals such as *New Left Review* (founded 1960), *New York Review of Books* (1963), and *Nouvel Observateur* (1964)—actively contributed to the "documentary turn" on the "market for Marx" (Niese 2017, 25). This documentary turn equates commitment and literary realism with political engagement (Roberts 1989, xv). It aims to be a "discovery process" of the "the new and the hitherto unreported, unrepresented, and unseen," and understands itself as a "conquest of reality and a weapon in cognitive struggle" (Jameson 2012, 476). As explained above, this paradigm shift did not come out of nowhere—certain changed social and political

circumstances during the 1960s led to a corresponding adaptation of reading practices and, consequently, to a changed status of Marxism (Sepp 2019, 232). Enzensberger and other politicized advocates of the documentary turn purposefully focused on revealing the facts of social existence, an investigation which they thought to be absent both on the rarified sphere of high-cultural literature and in the reportage of the bourgeois press (Brown 2013, 144). In the early 1970s, *Literaturmagazin*, by contrast, turned away from this explicit documentary realism towards a different Marxist aesthetic tradition, one that stressed experience rather than consciousness-raising. This changed emphasis in Marxist aesthetic theory has led *Literaturmagazin* to a contrasting assessment of the socially productive character of literature, emphasizing literature's utopian potential to emancipate consciousness. Its focus on individual experience rather than external cognitive guidance to transform consciousness, however, is as much situated in a historical context as *Kursbuch*'s previous documentary turn was.

In one sense, however, Niese's categorization of *Kursbuch* as both a "political literary magazine" and an "intellectual Marxist magazine" (2017, 26) applies as much to *Literaturmagazin*. In the following, I will briefly discuss *why* fundamentally different aesthetic approaches intending the same Marxist goal came into being, before examining the inherited aesthetic legacies in particular. To put it differently: why are this chapter's upcoming debates concerning realism, modernism, and utopianism important for understanding *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*? And what does the preference of a

specific theoretical angle tell us about a particular time, e.g. "1968" and its literary magazines? According to Hegel, the philosophy of a given time always unveils its *zeitgeist*:

> As far as the individual is concerned, each individual is in any case a *child of his time*; thus philosophy, too, is *its own time comprehended in thoughts*. It is just foolish to imagine that any philosophy can transcend its contemporary world as that an individual can overleap his own time or leap over Rhodes.[3] (Hegel 2003 [1821], 21–2)

In agreement with Hegel, I argue that an aesthetic paradigm shift in the magazines under investigation signifies a turn in its protagonists' and readerships' consciousness.

Current *Kursbuch* editor and German sociologist Armin Nassehi (1960–) argues that the *aesthetic of theory* (any theory, not just Marxism) impacts its plausibility, meaning that the formal construction and representation of a particular theory is an essential part of its content's credibility and intention (Nassehi 2003, 83). For example, Adorno's pessimistic writings on aesthetics (discussed in chapter 1), Nassehi argues, express in their form a mode of helplessness [*Ausgeliefertsein*], and by doing so, Adorno's theory is a paradoxical description of the condition of its own impossibility—an

[3] Hegel presumably means leaping over the city of Rhodes, or over its harbor, which was straddled by the Colossus of Rhodes, a huge statue of Apollo erected about 300 BC after Rhodes had withstood siege by the navy of Antigonus I (382–301 BC), King of Macedonia (Wood 2003, 391).

"aesthetic of self-denial."[4] Extending this logic, we can see that the magazines' positions on philosophy, literature, or theory have in themselves little imminent meaning—they need to be contextualized in their form and context to apprehend the consciousness of those involved (Sepp 2019, 218). I therefore suggest that understanding "1968" as an intellectual event—including its associated magazines—requires an understanding of the protagonists' *Marx appropriation*, asking what type of Marxism was engendered in correlation to what specific situation (ibid.). Going back to Adorno: "He who stands aloof runs the risk of believing himself better than others and misusing his critique of society as an ideology for his private interest" (2005 [1951], 43–4). Or to put it simply, differing appropriations of Marx's work emerge in response to historical developments and needs.

Three selected examples of divergent appeals to Marxism support the case I am making here for literary magazines: before "1968," the Cold War and its anti-communist bias made it difficult to study Marxism in any form, and so the theory became a sort of "secret or forbidden knowledge" taking on a bold style claiming rebellion (Sepp 2019, 220). During "1968," complex Marxist theories helped the student movement to present itself as a serious, intellectual, and critical entity (ibid., 223), one which produced more "scientific" or systematic Marxist writing. After "1968," however, many intellectuals leaders rejected the idea of students as a revolutionary class or as revolutionary subjects

[4] Original German Quote: "Die Ästhetik der kritischen Theorie in der klassischen Variante Adornos ist eine Ästhetik des Ausgeliefertseins, der paradoxen Beschreibung der Bedingung ihrer eigenen Unmöglichkeit [...] Die kritische Theorie ist eine 'Ästhetik der Selbstdementierung'" (Nassehi 2003, 83–4).

(as Marcuse and Buch already did years before), as their own experience had taught them. That skepticism made many of the older members of the 1968 revolutionary groups to return to Marxist "classics," focusing on the worker's movement (ibid., 225). These shifts in theoretical approaches referred in different ways to different Marxisms (and the 1968ers' awareness of such differences), which manifested themselves through authors' varying emphases on aspects of form and content for Marxist critique, depending on the context. Such questions thus yielded and legitimized very different forms of literary practice, both in style and genre use (ibid., 233). As I argue here, *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* embody (at least) two different aesthetics of theory in the Nassehian sense, which is crucial for understanding their agenda. Taken together, a comparison of both magazines therefore needs to include both the Marxist talking points as much as the historical condition that influenced those talking points.

The remaining sections of the chapter outline and historicize what I consider the most important twentieth-century debates on aesthetics that are relevant for situating the Marxist critiques of the two magazines, which were implicated not only in their political moments, as argued above, but also in their aesthetic context, which included discussions around realism, modernism, and utopianism.

BACK TO THE FUTURE: THE ACTIVISTS' LEGACIES OF MARXIST AESTHETICS

I have already outlined *Kursbuch*'s and *Literturmagazin*'s methodological approaches in terms of their central ideological decisions about what needed to be addressed in a transformation to a post-Nazi FRG consciousness. Enzensberger's vision for raising consciousness was mostly enacted through essays and texts that applied international social theory to illuminating contemporaneous problems. In *Kursbuch*'s early planning stage, therefore, literature was seen as a consciousness-raising complement to social theory. However, by 1968, Enzensberger denied the social role of art in a consciousness-transforming process. Buch, in contrast, wanted to use historical methods on practical examples in order to sublate the mechanical division of literary theory and praxis. In outlining *Literaturmagazin*'s publishing agenda, then, he insisted that literature (not only theory) could be a socially productive force and that utopian literature that produced new representations of society, rather than theoretical analysis critiquing them, would emancipate consciousness.

In comparing these two basic strategies in the sections that follow, I argue that *Kursbuch* exemplified a *documentary realist* and guided approach of consciousness-raising, which was characteristic for the 1960s "documentary turn" toward a politicization of literature (Brown 2013, 144).[5] *Literaturmagazin*'s Marxist approach, by contrast,

[5] The push toward a politicization of literature was connected with the rise of new literary forms, of which the so-called "documentary turn" was of particular importance: linked with a shift in the emphasis of literature from the past to the present, the documentary turn focused on the revealing facts of social existence seen to be absent both on the rarified sphere of high-cultural literature and in the reportage of the bourgeois press (Brown 2013, 144–5). Literary productions of the documentary turn frequently relied on evidence drawn from public hearings, recontextualized in order to reflect deeper truths about contemporary society (ibid.). Examples of this documentary turn are Friedrich Christian Delius's *We Employers* (1965), Hans Magnus Enzensberger's *The Havana Inquiry* (1970), Günter Wallraff's *We Need You* (1966) and *13 Undesired Reports* (1969), or Peter Weiss's *The Investigation* (1965). These works illustrate how the

rested on the assumption that individual experience rather than external cognitive guidance would be necessary to transform consciousness. In other words, both editors envisioned quite similar objectives for their magazines, but had different and even contradictory approaches on how to achieve those ends. Yet these programs were not theirs alone: Enzensberger and Buch both were referencing inherited aesthetic theories of consciousness-raising in order to situate *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* in the complex, unfinished, international, and contradictory field known as Marxist aesthetics. It is of course beyond the scope of this dissertation to provide an exhaustive overview of Marxist aesthetics.[6] I will therefore focus on a West German postwar debate in Marxist aesthetics, using as my case studies how Enzensberger's and Buch's aesthetic approaches in particular need to be understood as positioned within the broader scope of Marxist aesthetic history. In other words, the aesthetic debates which I will focus on in this chapter situate the aesthetic differences found in the magazines under investigation—they need to (and only can) be understood within both the wider scope of Marxist intellectual history and the contemporaneous events of the *long '68*.

---

documentary turn has much in common with critical journalism in that it seeks to uncover the machinations of power and to reveal hidden truths that lay under the façade of bourgeois democracy (ibid.).

[6] The following list includes selected publications in both German and English that summarize histories of Marxist aesthetics. For general overviews on Marxist aesthetics and its characterizations, institutional levels, key aspects, different interpretations, and paradigm shifts, see for instance Arvon (1973), Laing (1986 [1978]), Mayer (1994), Vázquez (1973 [1965]), or J. Wolff (1991). For canonical key texts on Marxist aesthetics, see Buch (1972d), Schmitt (1973), or Solomon (1979). For remarks on art by Marx and Engels themselves, see Baxandall and Morawski (1973), Laing (1986 [1978]), Lunn (1982), and Morawski (1970). For a focus on Marxist literary criticism, see Eagleton (1976), Foley (2019), Frow (1986), Jameson (1974 [1971]), Jehle (2015), Kunow (2015), Lehmann (1977), Prawer (1983), Raddatz (1969), Szeman (2014 [2009]), or Williams (1977). For the influence of Marxist aesthetics beyond literature, see for instance Baxandall (1968), Gandesha and Hartle (2017a), Hemingway (2006), Larsen and Millner (2019), Puchner (2006), or Rose (1984).

Aesthetics—the theory of sensual recognition (Mayer 1994, 649)—is crucial for Marxism, since it is "the closest bridge of philosophy to the concrete world" (P. Anderson 1976, 78).[7] After all, it was Marx himself who famously demanded, in his *Theses on Feuerbach*, that it is impossible to alter the concrete world through philosophy alone, but that a praxis was needed, arguing that "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it" (1978d [1888], 145).[8] And although there is no systematic theory of art in the writings of Marx and Engels, their various brief discussions of art have formed the basis for numerous attempts to produce a specifically Marxist aesthetics (J. Wolff 1991, 5). Based on the Marxist notion that humans make their own history, and that consciousness plays a crucial role in political transformation, aesthetic theoreticians and artists have drawn different approaches to defining art as a revolutionary aesthetic practice (ibid., 7).

Marx viewed reality as a relational field comprising the totality of human experience (Lunn 1982, 9). A key concept of Marxist aesthetics is therefore *realism*, which Engels defined as "the truthful reproduction of typical characters under typical circumstances" (Engels 1973 [1888], 114).[9] In reconstructing Marx's and Engel's suggestions, the four criteria for realism are:

(1) *typicality*: representative and typical situations and characters need to be presented within a concrete and socially conditioning, as well as specific, historical environment;

---

[7] See Williams (2015 [1976], 1–2) for an etymological and semantical discussion of the term *aesthetics*.
[8] Marx wrote the *Theses on Feuerbach* in the spring of 1845. Engels published them in 1888.
[9] Engels wrote the text in 1888, but it was first published in 1953.

(2) *individuality*: representative characters from the various social classes must be drawn with distinctive, unique, and individual qualities;

(3) *organic plot construction*: the political tendency of the work must come from the situation and the action itself, without explicit attention called to it; and finally

(4) *the presentation of humans as subjects as well as objects of history* (Lunn 1982, 26).

It should be emphasized that Marx and Engels had not labeled this realism as a "prescriptive aesthetic" of reproduction (ibid.). But many of their successors took a rather strict approach on the evaluation of realism, which, as I will show in the sections to come, caused a variety of debates about the *correct* form of Marxist aesthetics. I ultimately will argue that the two opposing approaches of consciousness-raising found in *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* are, in fact, a rerun of such earlier debates in Marxist aesthetics, exemplifying their dialectical, unfinished, and controversial nature.

This observation is not mine alone. As Hohendahl points out, significant paradigm shifts occurred in the politicization of aesthetic theory in West Germany during the 1960s:

> Nevertheless, these changes do not so much take place because new theorems are developed; rather, they result more from a rediscovery of older, obscured approaches and positions. In retrospect, this turn can be characterized as a break with modernist and avant-gardist aesthetics variously represented by Theodor W. Adorno and Gottfried Benn. (Hohendahl 1991, 157)

Nonetheless, specifically Marxist interventions have received less attention. In consequence, I will elaborate in the subsection "From Lukácsian Realism to the Death of Literature?" of this chapter how, using the example of Enzensberger, this anti-modernist shift turns into what I will subsequently define as *documentary realism*—an approach to Marxist aesthetic which will then, ultimately, serve as the target for Buch and *Literaturmagazin*.

As stated above, the idea of realism lies at the heart of much Marxist aesthetic thought. It refers to texts that offer accurate portrayals of a society and its structural (class) conflicts, through the use of *types*, which has been a central tenet in Marxist aesthetics (J. Wolff 1991, 6). But as Fredric Jameson rightly points out, the uniqueness and demands arrogated by realism are in themselves of a rather conflicting nature:

> The originality of the concept of realism, however, lies in its claim to cognitive as well as aesthetic status. […] But it is extremely difficult to do justice to both of the properties of realism simultaneously. In practice, an over-emphasis on its cognitive function often leads to a naïve denial of the necessarily fictive character of artistic discourse, or even to iconoclastic calls for the "end of art" in the name of political militancy. (2007 [1977], 198)

The resemblance of what Jameson calls the "end of art" to the notion of the *Death of Literature* (associated with Enzensberger; see the introduction's footnote 21) is evident; it references a major debate in Marxist aesthetics that arises from the fact that some Marxist positions regard realism as the *only* basis for revolutionary art, condemning consequently all modernism and avant-garde works as complicit with reaction (Laing 1986 [1978], vii).

Other Marxists state the opposite by pointing out what they define as the limitations of realism, which I will elucidate below. In other words, the contrasting Marxist aesthetics were directed in part toward the question of which literary traditions could best be utilized and reworked in the anti-fascist struggle: nineteenth-century realism or twentieth-century modernist forms (Lunn 1982, 75). For the German case, these disputes on how effective Marxist aesthetics should look like are summarized as the so-called *Realism-Modernism Debate*, which is crucial for the aesthetic positions found in *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* and will therefore be the focus of the sections to come.

Yet in examining such a debate, it is important to remember *why* Marxists should care about literature in particular or art in general in the first place. One answer can be found in looking at the opposite side of the coin from the Marxist aesthetics that talks about how art is produced: Marxist literary criticism, which stresses how art is to be consumed. As elsewhere in the extended field of Marxist aesthetic discussions, whether on production or consumption of artworks, there is "no such thing as *a* Marxist literary criticism: no established approaches, no clear methodology, no agreed-upon ideas about how to approach a text or what count as appropriate texts to read" (Szeman 2014 [2009], 380). One entry point to Marxist literary criticism, however, is the argument that literature can be understood to manifest what Walter Benjamin calls its *truth content* precisely because of the manner in which "art has congealed in a complex way the practical consciousness of its epoch" (Gandesha and Hartle 2017b, xxii). Or to put it differently, Marxist criticism analyzes literature and art in terms of the historical conditions which produce them, and it needs, similarly, to be aware of its own historical

conditions (Eagleton 1976, v). That is, Marxist criticism defines and reinforces the emphasis on one kind of realism, an emphasis that opens out but by no means exhausts Marxist aesthetics in an insistence on the dialectical relationship between the realism of the text and that of the interpreters' own ideological presupposition.

My reference to Marxist literary criticism as relating to Marxist aesthetics of production that defines what authors do is not mine alone. As Eagleton has argued, Marxist literary criticism

> is part of a larger body of theoretical analysis which aims to understand *ideologie*s—the ideas, values and feelings by which men experience their societies at various times. And certain of those ideas, values and feelings are available to us only in literature. To understand ideologies is to understand both the past and the present more deeply; and such understanding contributes to our liberation. (ibid.)

Marxism is therefore not only a method of socioeconomic analysis of a specific reality and a call for revolutionary social transformation of that reality, it is also an interpretative framework indispensable to an understanding of the relationship between literature and society—and thus, more generally, of the connections between ideas, attitudes, and emotions on the one hand and their grounding in historical forces on the other (Foley 2019, x). The Marxist study of literary texts and traditions can therefore "heighten our sensitivity to the ways in which language functions to bind people to the status quo, as well as to imagine alternatives to the way we live now" (ibid., xviii). It can "demonstrate how rebellion and acquiescence frequently cohabit within the same consciousness" and

"connect the struggle in the mind and heart with the struggle in the streets" (ibid.). Such statements point the way to explicit links between art, reality, and critical consciousness-raising.

Nonetheless, whereas most Marxist literary critics would probably agree on these objectives, their methodologies on how to achieve these goals are highly debated. This brings me back directly to the classical Marxist *Realism-Modernism Debate*, which I, again, understand as the intellectual predecessor of the different aesthetic positions found in *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*.

ORIGINS OF THE *REALISM-MODERNISM DEBATE*

Since the early twentieth century, the Marxist notion of realism as a strategy of representation has been attacked by modernists and critics supportive of modernism for at least two major reasons. First, it has been accused of being outdated for twentieth-century readers or audiences and therefore would have no power to politically radicalize (J. Wolff 1991, 7). Second, if that Marxist aesthetic theory comes to resemble traditional realism, based on the premise of a unified and coherent narrative that can adequately represent reality, the representations it produces would obscure real contradictions and oppositions in what reality the text reflects, and those representations would consequently project an artificial unity of the world, thus having its own inherent ideology (ibid.). Opponents of realism have argued that the modernist text, by contrast, would be able "to capture the contradictory, and allow the hidden and the silenced to speak, by techniques of textual fragmentation and interruption" (ibid.). Those are, roughly speaking, the two opposing

aesthetic standpoints in the debates concerning realism and modernism, with the former coming to mean "literatures of the long nineteenth century" and the latter, "literature of the long twentieth century" whose narratives challenge the possibility and utility of "realistic" representation. Such disputes will recur in our comparative analysis of *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*.

Remember that Buch makes very similar, anti-realist and modernist accusations in *Literaturmagazin*'s original call for submissions. He argues that *Kursbuch* and its overtly politicized understanding of literature need to be seen as fatally limited by ideologies ("stuck somewhere between Wittenau and North Korea"), ineffective ("well-intended but helpless literary politicization efforts"), and thus that its collaborators are insufficient in terms of consciousness-raising ("'leftist' literati […] are noteworthy by their remarkable unawareness of Marxist theory, especially in terms of aesthetics").[10] With such statements, however, another facet of debates within the field of Marxist aesthetics emerges, beyond concerns about how the artwork is constituted and consumed: the dispute about the *correct* way of utilizing art, which I shall briefly sketch, beginning in pre-revolutionary Russia and the dichotomy between the so-called *Formalists* on the one side, and official orthodox Soviet socialist *Realists* on the other.

Russian Formalists, to begin with, utilized advances in the study of linguistics to champion avant-garde poetry in particularly and Russian literatures in general, and like other avant-garde intellectuals such as the Constructivists, they allied themselves with the Russian Revolution in 1917, positing a parallel between their opposition to traditional art

[10] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* from Hans Christoph Buch and Jürgen Manthey from 14.02.1973.

and the rejection of traditional society by the proletariat (Laing 1986 [1978], 28–9). Formalists such as Viktor Shklovsky (1893–1984), Boris Eichenbaum (1886–1959), Jurij Tynyanov (1894–1943), and Roman Jakobson (1896–1982) argued that art and literature

> should be regarded as a practice which, through a variety of formal devices, enacts a transformation of received categories of thought and expression. Subverting the particular patterns of thought or perception imposed on reality by the categories of ordinary language, by dominant ideological forms or by the codes of other literary works, literature is thus said to make such forms strange and, in so doing, to weaken their grip on the ways in which we perceive the world. (Bennett 1979, 24)

In other words, according to the Formalists, literature should not be merely a "truthful reproduction" as demanded by Engels (1973 [1953], 114), but rather should "defamiliarize, make strange or challenge certain dominant conceptions" (Bennett 1979, 21). This defamiliarization, also called *ostranenie* and a clear parallel to Brecht's *Verfremdungseffekt*, could then "dislocate our habitual perceptions of the real world so as to make it the object of a renewed attentiveness" (ibid., 20). This attentiveness is their version of public consciousness-raising, which they hoped would create a new sphere for public discussion and consciousness in Russia. We find parallels to this technique in *Literaturmagazin*'s planning stage, where Buch assesses "art and literature as important socially productive forces that enable emancipatory fantasy (both individually and in the collective body)" by overcoming the *real*.[11]

[11] Ibid.

With the continuous Stalinization of the USSR during the 1930s, however, formalism and other movements advocating for the use of avant-garde art forms were censured and replaced by Soviet socialist realism. Bolshevist leader Lenin demanded as early as 1905 that literature "must become a component of organised, planned and integrated Social-Democratic Party work" (1978 [1905], 45). By 1934, socialist (or Soviet) realism was officially adopted as the goal of Soviet art at the first Congress of the Writers' Union (Laing 1986 [1978], 36–7). Communist Party leader Andrei Alexandrovich Zhdanov (1896–1948) was the main developer of this socialist realist theory, adopting Georgi Plekhanov's (1856–1918) sociology of art, in which the work of art was supposed to reflect the society which produced it (ibid., 41). The antecedents and icons of socialist realism that Zhdanov pointed to were works by authors such as Leo Tolstoy (1828–1910) and Maxim Gorky (1868–1936) (ibid., 42).

The different aesthetic programs in *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* can be traced back to these early twentieth-century Russian debates, typical for many sites within international Marxisms. There is even a case to be made for similarities between the *Death of Literature* thesis mentioned earlier and with dogmatic Soviet doctrines on realism. Enzensberger's vision of a guided "political alphabetization of Germany" (1974a [1968], 93), echoes to a certain extent Lenin's criteria of partisan literature. The latter famously demanded:

> Down with non-partisan writers! Down with literary supermen! Literature must become *part* of the common cause of the proletariat, "a cog and a screw" of one

> single great Social-Democratic mechanism set in motion by the entire politically-conscious vanguard of the entire working class. (1978 [1905], 45)

Buch therefore was arguably right when he contended that the (mainstream) New Left's narrow assessment of literature would be no different than their dogmatic East German and Soviet counterparts (1972e, 87). Moreover, it is not hard to see *Group 47* as such self-proclaiming literary supermen described by Lenin, and their claims of a new German literature as (falsely) non-partisan. In consequence, the *Literaturmagazin* founder took a different stance, suggesting that literature should release utopian fantasy to open out visions of realities instead of affirming repressive standards set by a single class (1972f [1971], 52).

Let me now turn more directly to the legacy of that *Realism-Modernism Debate* by investigating how the German speaking world adapted such orthodox Soviet art doctrines and discussions associated with it.

Western Marxism: New Aesthetics for New Politics

By making the connection between what has come to be known as an East Bloc debate and West Germany, I am here starting to turn directly to a genesis narrative for *Western Marxism*, often defined as a "subterranean tradition of humanist, subjectivist and undogmatic Marxism that was the negation of its official Soviet (or Eastern) counterpart" (Jay 1984, 2). The term itself was first introduced by French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908–61) in his 1955 work *Adventures of the Dialectic* (Feenberg 2014 [1981], xv). This "new" direction to Marxist aesthetics—a creative and undogmatic

grappling with problems and inadequacies of classical Marxist theory that occupied intellectuals in what would become Europe's Western Bloc—was a debate first centered in Germany in the years 1923–33, and then among intellectual exiles from Nazi Germany (Lunn 1982, 5).[12] The existence of such a Western Marxism is important for my dissertation, as its emergence expanded both twentieth-century continental Marxist theory in general and Marxist aesthetics in particular.

Conventional accounts of that legacy point to two major historical developments responsible for this paradigm shift from classical to a particularly Western Marxism. First, the failures of the European revolutions in the early 1920s and the emergence of fascism generated a "crisis of Marxism" (Kellner 1989, 12). As a result, Marxists such as Antonio Gramsci, Karl Korsch, Georg Lukács, and Herbert Marcuse concluded that, although the objective circumstances for a revolution were present, the subjective conditions were absent due to a lack of revolutionary consciousness, organization, and a clear notion of what socialism could bring in the West (ibid.). This realization subsequently caused an unprecedented turn in Marxist thought toward questions of consciousness and culture as a vital but neglected force within the historical dialectic of society, and as a means of better understanding the stabilizing features of modern capitalism (Lunn 1982, 5). As noted above, *Literaturmagazin* can also be considered a response to such a "failed" revolution. These similarities will be noted throughout this chapter, arguing, again, that "1968" was, at least intellectually speaking, a continuation of these Marxist debates within a Western Marxist perspective, not an unprecedented event.

[12] See for instance Gordon and McCormick (2013), Hake (2017), Kaes (1983), Raabe (1985 [1965]), Schulz (1993), and Zammito (1984) for aesthetic trends and debates in Germany during the interwar period.

A second major reason for the shift in Marxist thought was the publication of some of Marx's early writings for the first time, notably the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* in 1932, which, for Lukács, was the decisive factor that made a Marxist aesthetic now possible (Laing 1986 [1978], 1). In fact, it was not until the 1930s that Marxists such as Lukács and Brecht produced opposing Marxist theories that could claim being capable of guiding a socialist practice of the arts within capitalist society (ibid., viii). Lukács argued retrospectively:

> While most of the leaders of the Second International saw Marx exclusively, or at least primarily, as the man who revolutionized economics, we now started to understand that a new era had begun with him in the whole history of human thought. […] The acceptance of the independence and theoretical originality of Marxist aesthetics was the first step I took toward the understanding and realization of the new change in ideology. (1972 [1968], 49)

One major outcome of this new aesthetic contemplation in Marxism was the so-called *Realism-Modernism Debate*, to which I will now turn.[13] The aesthetic disputes between *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*, as we shall see, are a continuation of this debate from decades earlier. Understanding the Marxist positions of the journals in terms of consciousness-raising therefore requires understanding their aesthetic foundations.

The *Realism-Modernism Debate* started, not surprisingly, in a literary magazine: the German exiles' journal *Das Wort* [The Word], which was published in Moscow

[13] Alternative terms for this debate, especially in Germany, are for instance *Expressionism Debate*, *Realism Debate*, or *Brecht-Lukács Controversy* (Berg 1981, 458). I deploy the term *Realism-Modernism Debate* as used by Jameson (2012), who, however, also refers to it as the *Realism-Modernism Dilemma* or *Realism-Modernism Controversy* (2007 [1977], 197).

starting in 1936 (Cohen 1997, 1168). In September 1937, Klaus Mann (1906–49) and Alfred Kurella (1895–1975), the latter under the pseudonym Bernhard Ziegler, started a discussion on the aesthetic and political assessments of expressionism (which was generally considered a political avant-garde literature) in reference to its anti-fascist potential (ibid., 1167–9). The initial discussion was about the expressionist German poet Gottfried Benn (1886–1956), infamously known for his anti-Marxism and for not distancing himself from the Nazi regime. Mann asserted that there could be no connection made between expressionism and Benn's collaboration with the Nazis, since the former had no fixed (political) ideology. Kurella countered this assertion by stating that the spirit of expressionism in itself would eventually lead to fascism (ibid.)—I will return to this claim below, in the section committed to Lukács's aesthetic theory.[14]

For the sake of brevity, I will not provide an exhaustive overview of the entire debate and its protagonists; that has already been done more than adequately.[15] Instead, I shall highlight arguments and contributors which I consider most important for situating *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* within this debate, and, moreover, for understanding the magazines under investigation as a continuation of such earlier Marxist deliberations.

To start off this genealogy of Buch's and Enzensberger's projects as descending from this turn into a specifically Western Marxism, let me return to the aesthetic-political situation in the USSR starting in the 1930s, when Soviet socialist realism became the ideology that replaced all modernism and avant-garde aesthetics, including

[14] See also Griffin (2007) for a detailed discussion of the connection of modernism and fascism. Griffin argues that fascism is "a revolutionary species of political modernism" (ibid., 181).
[15] See for instance Berg (1981), Cohen (1997), Gallas (1971), Jameson (1974 [1971], 2012), Laing (1986 [1978]), Lunn (1982), or Schmitt (1973).

expressionism. This development had a major influence on Germany's Marxist debates, as demonstrated in the work of one of the fiercest adversaries of expressionism, Georg Lukács.

In the next sections, Lukács's aesthetic standpoints will be presented in order to argue that Enzensberger's *Kursbuch* at its "revolutionary" heyday around 1968 can be seen as a furthering stage of *Lukácsian Realism* (a term deployed in Jameson 2007 [1977], 204), as a Marxist "realism 2.0" so to speak.

FROM LUKÁCSIAN REALISM TO THE DEATH OF LITERATURE?

Admittedly, it might sound at first like a big stretch to go from Lukács's preference for realist literature and its political potential to Enzensberger's assertion that literature is socially purposeless. But I will show that the latter can in fact be seen as a (maybe overstretched) progression of the former. Let me begin with Lukács's idea of realism *in* literature in order to explain Enzensberger's realism exceeding *beyond* literature.

Stemming from pre-war Marxist thought, but eventually associated with the East Bloc, Hungarian Marxist philosopher Georg (György) Lukács is widely considered to be the "most prominent theorist of realism in the Marxist tradition" (Foley 2019, 145).[16] During the 1930s, he "single-handedly turned the Expressionism debate around into a discussion of Realism" (Jameson 2007 [1977], 200). He did so in several essays that

[16] See Raddatz (1972) and Vazsonyi (2000) for a concise biography, selected works, and further reading suggestions on Lukács. See in particular Királyfalvi (1975) for a detailed examination of Lukács's aesthetic theories.

questioned modernist art. In "Tendency or Partiality?" (1932), for example, he promoted the nineteenth-century realist novel as a superior model for contemporary literature and simultaneously denounced modernist experimentation as a symptom of social and cultural decay (Hake 2017, 268).

Lukács's most significant essay on socialist realism—"Art and Objective Truth"—appeared in 1934 in Russian in the Soviet magazine *Literaturnyi Kritik* (*Literary Critic*) and was published in German in 1954 (Rieser 1957, 237). Also in 1934, Lukács actively participated in the *Realism-Modernism Debate* with an article in *Das Wort* entitled "Expressionism: Its Significance and Decline," in which he alleges, in agreement with the previously mentioned Kurella, that the expressionist movement had unwittingly contributed to the spread of the kind of mystical irrationalism on which Nazism thrived (Lunn 1982, 76–7). In the article, he rejects modernist styles as follows:

> Their language, divorced from the objectivity of external reality, thus ossified into a hollow "monumentality[,]" and their inadequate ability to penetrate the content had to be replaced and concealed by the hysterical exaggeration of pictures and images thrown together without any internal connection. This language bears the clear marks of its class content, the helplessness, dressed up as "leadership" of a rootless and decomposing petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, caught in the midst of world-historical, even if still not fully matured, class struggles between proletariat and bourgeoisie. (1981 [1934], 110)

Over two decades later, Lukács continued to argue that modernism and avant-garde art would have no political power due to its lack of "concrete criticism," and that it therefore would be merely "an escape into nothingness" (1979 [1955], 397).

For the present work, it is critical to note that Enzensberger makes a similar claim in his essay "The Aporias of the Avant-Garde" (1962). The *Kursbuch* founder distinguishes modernity—which he considers in a different essay as virtually nothing but a pointless term full of confusion and arbitrariness (1960, 8)—from the avant-garde, which in his opinion is pointless too, since it either "spells repetition, deception, or self-deception" (1974c [1962], 40).[17] Despite disagreeing with Lukács on the latter's treatment and interpretation of the term avant-garde (ibid., 20–1), Enzensberger formulates a similar critique against the avant-garde as the one found in Lukács's account on modernism. Enzensberger argues that the "avant-garde metaphor does not contain the slightest reference to a revolutionary or even rebellious intent" (ibid., 30). What the Nazis have labeled *Degenerated Art* is for Enzensberger nothing but a conglomeration of "pictures on which nothing can be recognized and poems with nothing in them" (1974a [1968], 86). In other words, Lukács's disdain for modernism echoes Enzensberger's scorn for the avant-garde. Even though Lukács and Enzensberger disagree on defining these movements, both query their lack of revolutionary potential, and both end up with

[17] I understand and use the term modernity as a "new era of history, interpreted as a process of increasing secularization and innovation which posed the 'new age', 'modern times', against tradition and a static past. Modernity was thus associated with innovation, change, novelty and critical opposition to tradition and dogmatism" (Kellner 1989, 3). Avant-Garde can be defined as an "extreme faction of aesthetic modernity" (Langston 2008, 3).

distinguishable concepts of realism as a viable alternative to modernism and/or the avant-garde. I will compare Lukács's and Enzensberger's realist approaches below.

Lukács's notion of realism originates in his major philosophical work, *History and Class Consciousness* (1923). Like the early Marx, the early Lukács is a critic of the "alienation of reason" in modern capitalist society (Feenberg 2014 [1981], xv). He contends that, in the process of *reification*, individuals under capitalism would become thing-like, and accordingly perceive themselves, other individuals, social processes, and history as static, objectified entities detached from social and historical process and the possibility of social and self-transformation (Kellner 1989, 53). Lukács describes the impact of reification on consciousness as follows: "Just as the capitalist system continuously produces and reproduces itself economically on higher and higher levels, the structure of reification progressively sinks more deeply, more fatefully and more definitively into the consciousness of man" (1971a [1923], 93). Reified thought, consequently, would block someone from perceiving the totality of social and economic relations (J. Wolff 1991, 6). This is where literature comes into play. Lukács applies the Marxist critique of capitalist reification to literary realism, stating that a critical realist narrative voice would have the cognitive ability to uncover the construction of economic and social life through human interaction (Lunn 1982, 79).

To put Lukács's thoughts differently: in an alienated capitalist society, the great writer draws the social and the individual dialectically together into a complex totality, and great art, therefore, combats the alienation and fragmentation of capitalist society (Eagleton 1976, 13). Thus, Lukács defines realism as a literary mode in which the lives of

individual characters are portrayed as part of a narrative which situates them within and interrogated the complex historical dynamics of their society (Lunn 1982, 78). He concentrates his attention in his discussion of realism upon the nineteenth-century novels of Charles Dickens (1812–70), Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832), Walter Scott (1771–1832), Stendhal (1783–1842), and especially Honoré de Balzac (1799–1850) and Leo Tolstoy (1828–1910) (ibid.). Taken together, only such a canon of critical realism could, in Lukács's opinion, contest the mystifying effects of the "contemplative consciousness" fostered by reification, and only critical realism could convey knowledge of the fundamental dialectic of historical process (Foley 2019, 146).

Being a postwar Marxist of Western origin but living east of the Iron Curtain, Lukács later distinguishes between his favored critical realism and Soviet socialist realism. He argues that what differentiates critical realism from socialist realism is that the former, unlike the latter, describes socialism from the *outside*, tying the representation to the observable instead of to an abstract principle:

> By the "outside" method a writer obtains a typology based on the individual and his personal conflicts; and from this base he works towards wider social significance. The "inside" method seeks to discover an Archimedian [*sic*] point in the midst of social contradictions, and then bases its typology on an analysis of these contradictions. (1963 [1956], 94)

Thus, Lukács understands critical realism as a prerequisite for liberating socialist realism from its confining dogmatism. The greatness of critical realism, he states, would be its

"revelation of history's labyrinthine course," which ultimately would "assist socialist realism in finding a cure for its self-inflicted wounds" (ibid., 134).

Despite these efforts to de-dogmatize socialist realism, Lukács has been attacked for his inflexible approach to art. Renowned contemporaneous critics were Hanns Eisler (1898–1962), Anna Seghers (1900–83), and Ernst Bloch, as already mentioned.[18] Their main critique of Lukács is grounded in the argument that he would assume an uninterrupted social *totality*, a self-contained *Reality* (Cohen 1997, 1171). However, Jameson problematizes this disapproval, arguing that critical realism is about unveiling historical trends and networks rather than realities:

> But I believe that for Lukács totality was history, and that in reality […] his conception of realism had to do with an art whereby the narrative of individuals was somehow made to approach historical dynamics as such, was organized so as to reveal its relationship with a history in movement and a future on the point of emergence. Realism would thus have to do with the revelation of tendencies rather than with the portrayal of a state of affairs. (2012, 479)

While defending the Hungarian Marxist's notion of totality, Jameson does point out that Lukács has a too incomplete and intermittent sense of the relationship of class to ideology (Jameson 2007 [1977], 201), and also that his dismissal of "decadent" works of art rejects their actual buried social and political content (ibid., 202). Especially the last point echoes Buch's more visibly non-dogmatic, historical, and partisan approach to Marxism, in which the *Literaturmagazin* founder argues that Marxism needs to include bourgeois

[18] See for instance Cohen (1997, 1170–4) for critique on Lukács by Eisler and Seghers. I will come back to Bloch later in this chapter as I consider him relevant for understanding Buch and *Literaturmagazin*.

decadent art and ideology from the past in its analysis of society as a necessary tool for understanding the present (1972a, 20).

Even though Enzensberger also criticized Lukács for his nostalgic "theoretical and practical backwardness" (1974b [1970], 120), there is a noticeable similarity between their realist approaches. Lukács wants to awake workers by unmasking society's *reification* through *critical realism*, and Enzensberger wants to do the same by revealing the *industrialization of the mind* through what I will call from now on *documentary realism*, which salutes realism as "a conquest of reality and a weapon in cognitive struggle" (Jameson 2012, 476). Both thought that consciousness needs to be transformed through guided experience rather than individual experience, and both are dogmatic in their approaches and reject other methods of consciousness-raising (e.g. modernism for Lukács, or imagination-promoting and fictional art for Enzensberger).

I already mentioned Enzensberger's involvement in the magazine project *Revue Internationale*, which states in its agenda that literature should solely serve the establishment of truth and that every topic should be excluded that is not concerned with truth-seeking (Marmulla 2007, 39). I have also shown how in *Kursbuch*'s early stages, literature is intended to serve as a tool for truth-seeking. To paraphrase Enzensberger, any art that distracts or redirects that mission ought furthermore to be rejected. What is needed instead is politically engaged and purpose-driven content. Lukács shares that vision in his critique on modernism, arguing that in "any protest against particular social conditions, these conditions themselves must have the central place" (1979 [1955], 397). Because of this similarity, I therefore suggest that Lukács's scorn for modernist art must

be seen as following the same reasoning as Enzensberger's scorn for *belles-lettres* (and eventually literature altogether). Both critics claim that the only way art should be utilized for political purposes is by describing (and assuming) the "truth" through a guided process that transforms reified representation into a tool for critical reflection. I therefore make the case that Enzensberger's *documentary realism* is best understood as a hyperinflated extension of Lukács's *critical realism*.

Before we move on, it is important to remember why Marxists like Lukács debate the role and purpose of art as a social imperative. The ultimate goal of Marxism is to deliver "the story of the struggles of men and women to free themselves from certain forms of exploitation and oppression" (Eagleton 1976, v). Marxist aesthetic theoreticians agree on that aim. However, discussions concerning Marxist aesthetics debate *how* this story of struggle should be told. The realist, "truth"-telling approach found in Lukács and Enzensberger is only one side of the debate, defining consciousness-raising as a process guided by logic and experience, rather than affect.

The contrary is in part true for the other side of the coin: Bertolt Brecht, who will be the focus of the next sections, and Ernst Bloch and others, to whom I will turn later in this chapter. Their critique of Lukács and realism, I argue, again has a lot in common with Buch's assessment of Enzensberger (see chapter 2), which supports my larger argument that *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* continue a debate that started decades before 1968.

BRECHT'S FLEXIBLE REALISM

Today, Bertolt Brecht is better known as "one of the few great political playwrights of modern times" (Jameson 2016, 6) than as a theoretician.[19] His contributions to the *Realism-Modernism Debate*, however, are a crucial counterpart to Lukács and Enzensberger, especially in bridging classical Marxisms of the nineteenth century with approaches from the twentieth century. I will therefore commit the following sections to Brecht's contention with Lukács and dogmatic approaches to Marxist aesthetics. This dispute, I argue, is important for my dissertation since it sets the groundwork for the dispute that will be continued in Buch's aesthetic critique of Enzensberger.

Brecht did not publicly contribute to the *Realism-Modernism Debate* as it broke out. Worried about its impact, he opposed both the timing of the debate as well as Lukács's normative claims in it, arguing that literary magazines such as *Das Wort* should be utilized as an unambiguously anti-Nazi tool rather than a space for abstract and divisive debates on Marxist aesthetics (Cohen 1997, 1175). Brecht's deliberate silence was likely intended to increase the chance of magazines combating fascism, thus illustrating his strong valuation of political praxis, not just theoretical criticism. Despite his extensive writing on expressionism, realism, and formalism from 1938–40 (see Kuhn and Giles 2003, 205–70), however, it is noteworthy that only one article on the topic was actually published during Brecht's lifetime: "Breadth and Variety of the Realist Mode of Writing" (1954); another, titled "Popularity and Realism" (1958), was published shortly after his death; and the rest was not printed until the posthumous publication of *Schriften zur Literatur und Kunst*

[19] See Hutchinson (2000) for a concise biography, selected works, and further reading suggestions on Brecht.

[Writings on Literature and Art] in 1967 (Cohen 1997, 1175). Therefore, Brecht's theoretical stance in this contemporaneous debate may not have been apparent to scholars until the late 1960s (ibid.).

Another consequence for the scholarship also emerges in this reference to the *Realism-Modernism Debate*. The rediscovery of the majority of Brecht's theoretical aesthetic work occurred at the same time as the West German student movement, given which it is astonishing that, while Brecht's statements on Lukács and realism have been examined retrospectively in terms of their significance for the *Realism-Modernism Debate*, virtually no intellectual historiography connects them with "1968." Documentation for this connection exists: several publications between June 1965 (*Kursbuch* #1 is published) and October 1973 (*Literaturmagazin* #1 is published) prove increasing interest in the aesthetic debates between Brecht and Lukács during the student movement and its aftermath.[20] This section aims to address this lacuna, beginning with Brecht's contemplations on realism and tying them into the debates outlined heretofore.

Differences emerge almost immediately in these comparisons. Brecht argues that literature should not be "linked to the good old days but to the bad new ones" (2007b [1967], 69)—a clear reference to Lukács's fondness for nineteenth-century literature and a direction that becomes over as he refutes Lukács by name. Rather than embracing Lukács's literary nostalgia, however, Brecht demands new literary techniques that engage with the *zeitgeist*, particularly mass culture:

[20] The following publications on the dispute between Brecht and Lukács were issued between *Kursbuch* #1 (June 1965) and *Literaturmagazin* #1 (October 1973): Arvon (1973), Gallas (1971), Mittenzwei (1968), Raddatz (1972), Schmitt (1973), Völker (1966), and Žmegač (1969).

> Man does not become man again by stepping out of the masses but by stepping back into them. The masses shed their dehumanization and thereby men become men again – but not the same men as before. This is the path that literature must take in outrage when the masses are beginning to attract to themselves everything that is valuable and human, when they are mobilizing people against the dehumanization produced by capitalism in its fascist phase. (ibid.)

For Brecht, Lukács does not contribute to this mobilization against capitalism and fascism. On the contrary, he directly accuses the Hungarian Marxist of a "utopian idealism," arguing that Lukács would be more concerned with "enjoyment rather than struggle," embodying "a way of escape rather than an advance" (ibid.).

Brecht's alternative to Lukács's normative realism is a more flexible approach: "Our concept of realism must be wide and political, sovereign over all conventions" (2007a [1958], 82). The role of literature is for Brecht not to offer a coherent representation of reality, as suggested by Lukács, but to encourage critical questioning about why that reality exists (Foley 2019, 147). Brecht therefore defines realism's goals as follows:

> Realistic means: discovering the causal complexes of society / unmasking the prevailing view of things as the view of those who are in power / writing from the standpoint of the class which offers the broadest solutions for the pressing difficulties in which human society is caught up / emphasizing the element of development / making possible the concrete, and making possible abstraction from it. (2007a [1958], 82)

Where for Lukács the goal of realist literary representation is to embody the dialectics within totality, Brecht's realism requires first and foremost an assault upon the dominant ideologies producing false notions of totality (Foley 2019, 148). In taking a rather non-dogmatic approach, as Buch will do decades later in *Literaturmagazin* and his other publications, Brecht argues that

> With the people struggling and changing reality before our eyes, we must not cling to "tried" rules of narrative, venerable literary models, eternal aesthetic laws. We must not derive realism as such from particular existing works, but we shall use every means, old and new, tried and untried, derived from art and derived from other sources, to render reality to men in a form they can master. We shall take care not to describe one particular, historical form of novel of a particular epoch as realistic – say that of Balzac or Tolstoy – and thereby erect merely formal, literary criteria for realism. (2007a [1938], 81–2)

Instead, Brecht asserts that "we must interrogate reality about literary forms, not aesthetics, not even the aesthetics of realism. The truth can be withheld in many ways, and it can be told in many ways. We derive our aesthetics, like our morality, from the needs of our struggle" (2003 [1954], 227). Brecht therefore envisions realism to be a practical and flexible tool for Marxist purposes, not a constricted set of rules. Following the idea of Western Marxism mentioned above, Brecht is arguably one of the first theoreticians who tried to emancipate Marxist aesthetics from narrow-minded dogmatism.

Taken together, these statements indicate why Brecht sees traditional bourgeois realism, as endorsed by Lukács, as the "enemy for political reasons," because it "either

encouraged acceptance of the status quo by way of its stereotypes or left no place for political pedagogy" (Jameson 2012, 477). Brecht's aesthetic, by contrast, restores to realistic art the principle of experimental aesthetic gratification and innovation which the cognitive aesthetic of Lukács seems to replace with the "grim duty of a proper reflection of the world" (Jameson 2007 [1977], 205). In that sense, Brecht's unconventional and non-dogmatic Marxism is crucial for understanding and distinguishing the aesthetic approaches found in *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*. As Jameson rightly points out,

> it is necessary to emphasize the inextricable relationship between Brecht's aesthetic and the analysis of the media and its revolutionary possibilities worked out jointly by him and Walter Benjamin […] [T]hey foresaw a revolutionary utilization of communications technology such that the most striking advances in artistic technique – effects such as those of "montage", for instance, which today we tend to associate almost exclusively with modernism as such – could at once be harnessed to politicizing and didactic purposes. (2007 [1977], 207)

Brecht moved beyond Lukács in realizing that Marxist theory undermines itself when it makes any normative claims. Instead, it needs to be reflexive about the society it analyses. As Brecht's friend and Marxist theoretician Karl Korsch points out, Marx himself knew that his theory was not a *supra-historic* principle that could be applied to any period or the whole history of human society without a previous investigation of the actual historical facts (2016 [1938], 121). Just as any other experimental natural and social science, Korsch argues, "the Marxian theory of society cannot take its departure from a preconceived and dogmatic principle; even less so because the science of Marx is a 'critical' rather than a

positive one" (ibid., 121–2). That also applies to aesthetics, which has the purpose of critiquing a present. In general, Korsch's impact on Brecht cannot be underestimated. Not only did Korsch strongly influence Brecht's conception of Marxist dialectics, but the Marxist ideas that were most fruitful for Brecht's aesthetic practice were precisely the ideas shared by Brecht and Korsch in their conception of materialist dialectics and revolutionary practice (Kellner 1980, 29).

For many good reasons, Lukács is widely considered to be a key figure in the renewal of Marxist theory and more critical and reflexive investigations of its premises. His concept of literature, however, is marked by precisely this kind of normative dogmatism and inflexibility when he establishes a canon of past novels as examples of proper critique. Brecht criticizes Lukács's stubbornness toward modern and experimental approaches to art.

The parallel to Buch's critique of Enzensberger is evident. Brecht attacks Lukács for the latter's "escape" into "idealism" (2007b [1967], 69), and Buch attacks Enzensberger for his "petit-bourgeois resignation" (1969, 45). Brecht criticizes Lukács's "eternal aesthetic laws" and "merely formal, literary criteria" (2007a [1938], 81–2), and Buch condemns Enzensberger's overtly formalized, politicized understanding of literature in *Kursbuch* as fatally ideologically limited.[21] Against Lukács's and Enzensberger's approach of a guided and cognitive realism, Brecht advocates a political pedagogy through art that emphasizes the role of the recipient, and Buch too argues against repressive aesthetic standards, stating that it is art that can release the audience's utopian fantasy (1972f [1971],

[21] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* from Hans Christoph Buch and Jürgen Manthey from 14.02.1973.

52). Buch therefore agrees with Brecht's more flexible and non-dogmatic approach to Marxist aesthetics as necessarily adapted to immediate circumstances. Moreover, the *Literaturmagazin* founder also explicitly takes side with Brecht's critique of Lukács. With a direct reference to Brecht, Buch harshly criticizes Lukács for his "non-Marxist, ultimately bourgeois-conservative attitude, which is hidden behind a dogmatic façade."[22]

But Brecht's intervention in Lukácsian realism is not enough for understanding Buch's sophisticated aesthetic critique of what I have called Enzensberger's *documentary realism*, with its more fixed notions of Realist representation. Another person to whom Buch refers to while critiquing Lukács is Ernst Bloch, who was an important defender of expressionism against Lukács's strictures upon the movement in the 1930s, as I have mentioned above (Lunn 1982, 4). Where Lukács's cultural thinking emphasizes *continuities* between the bourgeois order and that which is to develop out of it, Bloch and other theoreticians of his era already had suggested the need to conceive the transition to socialism in terms of *radical difference*, of a more absolute break with past and present (Jameson 2007 [1977], 210). This approach then opens the window to a more utopian Marxism, to which I will now turn to, arguing that these utopian principles are crucial for understanding Buch's aesthetic conception of *Literaturmagazin*.

[22] Original German quote: "Meine Kritik gilt nicht etwa dem marxistischen Anspruch von Lukács' Theorie – das wäre ein Mißverständnis –, sondern der unmarxistischen, letztlich bürgerlich-konservativen Haltung, die sich hinter der dogmatischen Fassade verbirgt" (Buch 1972g, 218).

FROM UTOPIAN SOCIALISM TO SEEDS OF IMAGINATION

Understanding a contemporaneous Marxist approach to utopianism is crucial for situating Buch's aesthetic theory and praxis, which aim to access the readers' utopian fantasies in order to liberate themselves from repressive social and political norms (1972f [1971], 52). The liberating potential of utopian fantasies is therefore not surprisingly a key concept in *Literaturmagazin*. The journal's third issue, published in 1975 and edited by Nicolas Born (with editorial assistance from Buch), is entitled *"Die Phantasie an die Macht": Literatur als Utopie* ["Power to Fantasy": Literature as Utopia]. *Literaturmagazin* #3 is thus entirely committed to the possibilities and limitations of utopianism.

The term *utopia*—first coined in 1516 by English humanist Thomas More (1478–1535)—refers to "the paradise that doesn't exist" (Canavan 2019, 425). In pre-Marxist socialist thought, *utopian socialism* stands for the imagination of the possibility of total social transformation involving the elimination of individualism, competition, and private property (Jones 1991, 561). However, that original utopian framework does not recognize the necessity of class struggle and the revolutionary role of the proletariat in accomplishing this transition, and so it is inadequate for framing socialist critique (ibid.). Marx and Engels condemn utopian socialism because of what they consider to be a tension between *perfectability* and *plausibility* in utopian political transformation (Canavan 2019, 425). In their *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, for instance, Marx and Engels attack utopian socialists as follows:

> Hence, they [utopian socialists] reject all political, and especially all revolutionary, action; they wish to attain their ends by peaceful means, and endeavour, by small

> experiments, necessarily doomed to failure, and by the force of example, to pave the way for the new social Gospel. (1978 [1848], 498)

Utopian socialists' fantastic pictures of a future society, Marx and Engels assert, would interrupt the development of class consciousness by redirecting the critique of society in unhelpful directions, i.e. distracting the workers from the present class struggle (Canavan 2019, 426). However, Marx's idea of a future state, in which class antagonisms will be resolved, is also arguably somewhat a utopian vision itself; and due to this hidden and contradictory optimism, many subsequent Marxists have been attracted to the study of utopia in connection with Marx's hypothetical communist goal of the classless end-state of history notion of communism (ibid., 426–7). Such later Marxist theoreticians, some of whom I will briefly introduce below, try to connect a human yearning for a better world in times of despair with productive forces able to transform society.

Walter Benjamin's concept of *messianism*, for example, argues that each terrible moment of class domination and exploitation also contains within itself the possibility of its own supersession (ibid.).[23] Benjamin insists that desiring an optimistic future is crucial in times of despair because it points backwards at a comprehensible origin and forward to a future, stating that "Only for the sake of the hopeless ones have we been given hope"

[23] *Messianism* is grounded in the "cabbalistic doctrine of *tikkun*, the Messianic restitution of the original state of divine harmony broken by the *shevirat ha kelim*, the 'breaking of the vessels'" (Löwy 2005 [2001], 67). In the dominant tradition of rabbinical Judaism, the Messiah will arrive and will be able to "still the storm, to bandage the wounded, reawaken the dead and mend what has been put asunder" (ibid.). For Benjamin, however, this "classless society of the future – the new Paradise – is not the return pure and simple to the society of prehistory: it contains in itself, as dialectical synthesis, the whole of humanity's past" (ibid.). Ultimately, it is for Benjamin not a matter of awaiting the Messiah, but of bringing about his coming (ibid., 104). Benjamin's *messianism* therefore combines the (usually contradictory) concepts of Marxism and Jewish theology: he transforms them and situates them in a "relation of reciprocal illumination that enables them to be articulated together in a coherent way" (ibid., 20).

(2004b [1924], 356). In 1940, while fleeing the Nazis as a Jewish refugee, and shortly before eventually committing suicide, Benjamin writes in his *Theses on the Philosophy of History*, which offers the most familiar version of this argument: "For every second of time was the strait gate through which the Messiah might enter" (2007 [1940], 264). While there is debate as to whether Benjamin's theses are a break with Marxism or not, they assert the notion of *hoping for something better* as inevitably grounded in moments of *despair in the present*.[24]

This conviction is identifiable in the work of German philosopher Ernst Bloch as well. His three-volume magnum opus, *The Principle of Hope*, written between 1938–47 while exiled in the US, sets forth his fully developed system of *theoretical messianism*, showing the potency of the human yearning for a better world (Marsden 1989, 32). Bloch claims that humans are living in a prehistory, waiting for the "right world" yet to come: "*True genesis is not at the beginning but at the end* [italics in the original], and it starts to begin only when society and existence become radical, i.e. grasp their roots" (1986 [1959], 1375). The central thesis of Bloch's work is that Marxism has become distorted and impoverished due to the exclusion of utopian elements, and he aims to revitalize Marxism through a creative incorporation of such utopianism into the movement's critique (Marsden 1989, 32). Similar to Benjamin's *messianism* described above, which emphasizes the need for hope, Bloch is concerned that Marxism, without such a spiritual or superstructural motivation, would degenerate into a mere mechanistic materialism and critique of capitalism (Kearney 1994 [1986], 201).

[24] See for instance Beiner (1984), Lilla (1995), or Löwy (2005 [2001]) for varied interpretations of Benjamin's *Theses on the Philosophy of History*.

In defending expressionism against Lukács's attacks mentioned above, Bloch stresses the importance of individual experience rather than external cognitive guidance—a dichotomy which I have shown is also central in comparing Enzensberger's and Buch's aesthetic theoretical works. Bloch asserts that Lukács "does not get to the core of the matter, the imaginative works which make a concrete impression in time and space, a reality which the observer may re-experience for himself" (2007 [1938], 18–9). Unlike Brecht, Bloch furthermore questions Lukács's entire starting premises concerning the *Truth* and the *Real*: "But what if Lukács's reality – a coherent, infinitely mediated totality – is not so objective after all? What if his conception of reality has failed to liberate itself completely from Classical systems? What if authentic reality is also discontinuity?" (ibid., 22). In contrast to the assumption of *one* totality, Bloch states that "life as a whole is full of utopian projections, mirrored ideals, dream-manufactories, and travel pictures" (1979 [1963], 579). For utopian Marxist aesthetic theoreticians like Bloch and Buch, it is those hidden potentials which need to be liberated, for example through art.

A great insistence on concrete goals for that future emerges in this thought, as introduced by Bloch with his insistence of hope, but developed more fully in later thinkers. Bloch argues that "[a]ction will release available transitional tendencies into active freedom only if the utopian goal is clearly visible, unadulterated and unrenounced" (ibid., 582). Subsequently, in the context of "1968," Herbert Marcuse then takes Bloch's claim even further and advocates for "The End of Utopia," arguing that Marxism needs to treat utopia as a viable reality rather than an impossible concept:

> Marxism must risk defining freedom in such a way that people become conscious of and recognize it as something that is nowhere already in existence. And precisely because the so-called utopian possibilities are not at all utopian but rather the determinate socio-historical negation of what exists, a very real and very pragmatic opposition is required of us if we are to make ourselves and others conscious of these possibilities and the forces that hinder and deny them. An opposition is required that is free of all illusion but also of all defeatism, for through its mere existence defeatism betrays the possibility of freedom to the status quo. (1970a [1967], 69)

Several decades after the *Realism-Modernism Debate*, almost ten years after the controversial *Death of Literature* thesis and Marcuse's own call for the "End of Utopia," and long after *Kursbuch*'s and *Literaturmagazin*'s first emergence, Marcuse reemphasizes in his last work—*The Aesthetic Dimension*—the political significance of art:

> I see the political potential of art in art itself, in the aesthetic form as such. Furthermore, I argue that by virtue of its aesthetic form, art is largely autonomous vis à vis the given social relation. In its autonomy art both protests these relations, and at the same time transcends them. Thereby art subverts the dominant consciousness, the ordinary experience. (1978 [1977], ix)

Art for Marcuse, whose analysis is specifically geared towards literature, is by all means not socially purposeless, as suggested by Enzensberger in 1968 (1974a [1968], 92). There are parallels to Adorno's argument that art has the potential to unveil the world's misery from a distance (see chapter 1). However, Marcuse sees in art a political potential, not just

a tool for understanding despair. Marcuse's argument therefore lines up with Buch's assertion that "the consciousness-raising depiction of alienation through art is the first step of its sublation" (1972h [1970], 82).

In taking a utopian modernist stand, Marcuse argues that "expressionism and surrealism anticipated the destructiveness of monopoly capitalism, and the emergence of new goals of radical change" (1978 [1977], xi). Lukács's assumption of reality is for Marcuse nothing but an *established* reality (i.e. an agreed on and not fixed reality): "The truth of art lies in its power to break the monopoly of established reality (i.e., of those who established it) to *define* what is *real*" (ibid., 9). For Marcuse, normative realist approaches to art are counterrevolutionary since they devalue the political function of individual consciousness and subconscious, which, depending on how one wants to utilize them, can be either regressive or emancipatory (ibid., 3). He states:

> The subjectivity of individuals, their own consciousness and unconscious tends to be dissolved into class consciousness. Thereby, a major prerequisite of revolution is minimized, namely, the fact that the need for radical change must be rooted in the subjectivity of individuals themselves, in their intelligence and their passions, their drives and their goals. (ibid., 3–4)

Another similarity between Buch and Marcuse is worth pointing out. I have outlined in chapter 2 that Buch, while planning *Literaturmagazin*'s second issue, criticizes what he considers an undialectical literary reception of Goethe from both the New Left and the literary establishment. The "bourgeois Goethe cult," he argues, "has long outlived itself" and "has been replaced by a radical left-wing scorn for Goethe, 'unmasking' him as a

reactionary court flunky." However, Buch continues, it is "not the task of materialist analysis to label Goethe either as a reactionary or a revolutionary, but rather to dialectically render visible the compromises he made in relation to his historical accomplishments."[25]

Marcuse shares Buch's evaluation insofar as he is criticizing "realism as the model of progressive art" that denigrates "romanticism as simply reactionary" (1978 [1977], 6). A Marxist theory of art, Marcuse suggests, should not solely be evaluated by its material conditions:

> Marxist theory is not family research. The progressive character of art, its contribution to the struggle for liberation cannot be measured by the artists' origins nor by the ideological horizon of their class. Neither can it be determined by the presence (or absence) of the oppressed class in their works. The criteria for the progressive character of art are given only in the work itself as a whole: in what it says and how it says it. (ibid., 19)

Taken together, I argue that both Buch's and Marcuse's stances on Marxist aesthetics are heading in the same direction: maybe, after all, the liberating autonomy of art can unveil dogmatism within Marxism and therefore be able to emancipate Marxism from *itself*. This notion of a left ideology in itself that needs to be overcome and the valuation of enabling emancipatory fantasy within humans themselves are still crucial aspects of contemporary Marxist approaches to utopianism, to which I will turn to now briefly in order to not only show the similarities to especially Buch but also to stress the on-going relevance of the debates discussed in this chapter.

---

[25] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief an Autoren und Mitarbeiter des LITERATURMAGAZINS (2)* from Hans Christoph Buch from December 1973.

Twenty-first-century Marxist approaches to utopia, notably by Fredric Jameson, stress the importance of utopian thought for Marxism by arguing that ultimately "Marxist politics is a Utopian project or program for transforming the world, and replacing a capitalist mode of production with a radically different one" (2009, 416). Jameson distinguishes between a *utopian program* and *utopian impulse* (2005, 3). The utopian program, on the one hand, is "systemic, and will include revolutionary political practice, when it aims at founding a whole new society, alongside written exercises in the literary genre" (ibid.). The utopian impulse, on the other hand, is "an allegorical process in which various Utopian figures seep into the daily life of things and people and afford an incremental, and often unconscious, bonus of pleasure unrelated to their functional value or official satisfactions" (ibid., 5). To put it differently, utopian programs are "imagined blueprints for Utopia, always hopelessly compromised and corrupted by the limitations of their origins in the pre-Utopian mind," whereas the utopian impulse "animates and motivates all human creativity" (Canavan 2019, 428). As stated in chapter 2, it is precisely the latter which Buch refers to in his "assessment of art and literature as important socially productive forces that enable emancipatory fantasy (both individually and in the collective body)."[26]

The need for such emancipatory fantasies does not seem to have lost relevance for twenty-first-century contexts, as recent works by theoreticians such as Jameson (2016), Nilges (2019), Thompson and Žižek (2013), and Žižek (2019 [2018]) illustrate. Jameson argues that in late capitalism, utopianism, in order to be emancipatory, must first and

[26] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* from Hans Christoph Buch and Jürgen Manthey from 14.02.1973.

foremost move from a critique of capitalism and its ideologies to an analysis of anti-utopianism:[27]

> Utopians must proceed like that: they have to concentrate not on visions of future happiness, but rather on treatments of that stubborn resistance we tend to oppose to it and to all the other proposals for positive change in this now worldwide society. Utopian thinking must first involve the radical therapy for dystopia, its radical treatment and cure; only then can it begin to spin out its own impossible pipe dreams. (2016, 54)

Žižek identifies this fear of utopianism as a ubiquitous ideology inherent to late capitalism:

> The predominant ideology today is not a positive vision of some utopian future but a cynical resignation, an acceptance of how "the world really is", accompanied by a warning that, if we want to change it (too much), only totalitarian horror can ensue. Every vision of another world is dismissed as ideology. (2019 [2018], 17)

Today's progressive Left, Žižek argues, needs to reflect on its own ideology within capitalism. He argues that so-called *seeds of imagination*, i.e. "the particular topic or deadlock that triggers the process out of which the revolution grows" (2016b, 267), are crucial for transforming contemporary leftist thought, which in itself needs to be liberated:

---

[27] According to Belgian economist Ernest Mandel (1923–95), late capitalism "constitutes *generalized universal industrialization* for the first time in history. Mechanization, standardization, over-specialization and parcellization [*sic*] of labour, which in the past determined only the realm of commodity production in actual industry, now penetrate into all sectors of social life" (1976 [1972], 387). In following Mandel, Jameson periodizes late capitalism starting the 1940s, considering it as the dialectical expansion of its two previous stages: market capitalism (starting the 1840s) and monopoly/imperial capitalism (starting the 1890s) (1984, 78).

> What today's radical left needs are such "seeds of imagination" that would enable it not only to provide a new vision of a Communist society, but also to break out of the terrifying impoverishment of our power of imagination in our late capitalist society. (ibid., 268)

To put it briefly, Jameson and Žižek both argue that utopianism can and must emancipate the Left's as well as the general population's consciousness, which is in itself enslaved by late capitalism. As Žižek argues: "to change society one should begin by changing one's dreams about an emancipated society" (2016a, vii).

Mathias Nilges's most recent work suggests that such dream-altering ambitions appear as particularly challenging in late capitalism, a time when it "seems to be easier for us to imagine the complete destruction of civilization or of our world than to imagine even a modest change to our capitalist present" (2019, 11). Nilges examines how contemporary right-wing culture is a direct result of what he calls a *Crisis of Futurity*, i.e. "our seeming inability to imagine the future as difference and as the time of substantive alternatives to our present" (ibid., 4). Right-wing culture exploits this crisis of futurity by presenting the past as a model of stability and order: "the way forward, the Right argues, lies in a return to the past" (ibid., 10). Like Thompson and Žižek (2013) did five years earlier, Nilges stresses not only the importance of utopian thought for twenty-first-century anti-capitalism, but particularly the work of Ernst Bloch, arguing that "Bloch's work allows us striking insights into the power of the forgotten, into the potential that the past holds for both new moments of danger and the formulation of new forms of utopian thought that our era urgently needs" (ibid., 14).

Anti-utopianism, the contemporary crisis of futurity, and the rise of twenty-first-century right-wing culture all revitalized discussions concerning the advantage of utopian anti-capitalism over realist anti-capitalist guidance, because the political power and the possibility of utopian thought, i.e. the "kind of thought that stands steadfastly opposed to capitalist presentism and right-wing reaction […] lies not in what was or in what may never be but in that which was never allowed to be ... in that which may yet come to pass" (Nilges 2019, 17). Taken together, we see how debates from the early decades of the twentieth century find themselves rejuvenated around 1968 and, ultimately, even more relevant for contemporary contexts.

Moreover, the similarity between Buch's criticism of the New Left and charges by Jameson, Nilges, Thompson, and Žižek against the twenty-first-century Left are evident. For example, the call that the Left needs to question its own ideology can be found in Buch's work as well. As I have mentioned in chapter 2, the *Literaturmagazin* founder demanded in his journal's call for submissions: "The atmosphere needs to be cleansed from all (left- and right-wing) forms of Obscurantism and Opportunism, from the clerical power that governs today's Marxist thought, and from the bourgeois feuilleton mafia."[28] Furthermore, Buch was already asserting before the year 1968 that his contemporaneous leftists are in a bubble beyond which they neither see nor understand. As outlined in chapter 1, Buch argues that West Germany's Left of the late 1960s was itself rooted in the bourgeoisie and their own privileged position made them the beneficiaries of capitalist exploitation, and, therefore, ultimately counterrevolutionary (1968 [1967], 134–6). This

[28] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* from Hans Christoph Buch and Jürgen Manthey from 14.02.1973.

claim echoes Žižek's twenty-first-century analysis of contemporary anti-capitalist movements: "One should not forget that the agent of popular pressure is always a minority – even the Occupy Wall Street was, with regard to its active participants, much closer to 1 per cent [*sic*] than to the 99 per cent [*sic*] of its big slogan" (2019 [2018], 55). Taken together, Buch in 1967 and Žižek in 2016 thus share one goal—to "radically rethink the leftist project" (Žižek 2016a, vii)—and both value utopianism as viable for that project.

SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS: AESTHETIC FAILURES OF THE '68 MARXISTS

When Buch condemns "the well-intended but helpless literary politicization efforts" by the 68ers, who are "noteworthy by their remarkable unawareness of Marxist theory, especially in terms of aesthetics," he also seems to reject documentary realism as a failed aesthetic dogmatism, considering it as weak as the student revolt itself.[29] Two years earlier, the German-British Western Marxist George Lichtheim (1912–73) had already diagnosed the apparent success of Western modernism over the Eastern dogmatic realism that resembled documentary realism more than Buch's aesthetic: "West Germany today, unlike its Eastern neighbour beyond the Wall, provides a meeting-place of Marxism and modernism" (1971, 130).

But does that mean that 1960s engaged documentary realism proved unfeasible for a revolutionary Marxist aesthetic? Or do the claims made by Buch and Lichtheim elevate modernism just merely to another dogma itself? Yes and no. As Jameson puts it, there is

[29] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* from Hans Christoph Buch and Jürgen Manthey from 14.02.1973.

"some question whether the ultimate renewal of modernism, the final dialectical subversion of the now automatized contentions of an aesthetics of perceptual revolution, might not simply be . . . realism itself" (2007 [1977], 211). Considering that many leftists of the 1960s (Enzensberger being one of them) salute *documentary realism* as "a conquest of reality and a weapon in cognitive struggle," Jameson points out a paradox:

> [G]enuine realism, taken at the moment of its emergence, is a discovery process, which, with its emphasis on the new and the hitherto unreported, unrepresented, and unseen, and its notorious subversion of inherited ideas and genres […] is in fact itself a kind of modernism, if not the latter's first form. (Jameson 2012, 476)

But Jameson reminds us that, at the end of the day, every attempt of understanding the "real world" only creates confusing interpretations of an assumed reality, which holds true for Marxist aesthetics:

> In such extinct yet still virulent intellectual conflicts, the fundamental contradiction is between history itself and the conceptual apparatus which, seeking to grasp its realities, only succeeds in reproducing their discord within itself in the form of an enigma for thought, an aporia. (2007 [1977], 213)

But does that mean that the question of how to utilize art in combatting capitalism and fascism is pointless due to the impossibility of grasping reality? Not at all, at least not in a Marxist sense. Marxist dialectics, we remember, is about the "progressive unification through the contradiction of opposites" (Williams 2015 [1976], 67). This also applies to aesthetics, as French intellectual historian Henri Arvon (1914–92) points out:

> Marxist [a]esthetics remains all the more open to a total and ever-changing application of dialectics in that it is one of the rare branches of Marxist doctrine not to have been crushed and smothered beneath the weight of rigid dogma established once and for all and drummed into its proponents by an almost ritualistic recitation of magic formulas. (1973 [1970], 2–3)

To put Arvon differently, there cannot be a single *correct* Marxist aesthetic.

Let us remember Korsch, who argued that Marxism should be *critical* rather than *positive* (2016 [1938], 122)—the same can and should be said here about Marxist aesthetics. Moreover, what becomes clear is that Marxist theoreticians such as Adorno (whose pessimistic aesthetic viewpoints I have outlined in chapter 1), Benjamin, Bloch, Brecht, Lukács, or Marcuse are not "Marxists" in any simple sense of the term—many other currents of thought play equally important roles in their work, and their Marxisms are a "highly selective, even truncated, affair" (Lunn 1982, 215). As I have shown and will continue to demonstrate in the upcoming chapters, the same can be said about Enzensberger and Buch. I furthermore agree with intellectual historians such as Eugene Lunn (1941–90), who asserts that the importance of aesthetic modernism and of related aspects of modern cultural and social life for the development of the "Western Marxist" narrative has not been sufficiently understood (1982, 282). This observation closes the circle and brings me back to *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*.

The aesthetic debates which I have outlined in this chapter situate the aesthetic differences found in the magazines under investigation—they need to (and only can) be understood within both the wider scope of Marxist intellectual history and the

contemporaneous events of the *long '68*. *Kursbuch*'s editorial turn towards non-fiction and the exclusion of all literary contributions that were not factually objective and documentary was, of course, rooted both in the anti-literary attitude of the student movement and Enzensberger's own view on Marxist aesthetics (Schlichting 1977, 52). As the *Kursbuch* founder himself states in 1968:

> When the brightest heads between twenty and thirty are more interested in an agitation model than an "experimental text"; when they prefer to use faktographs [*sic*] to picaresque novels; when they sneer at literature, both its production and consumption—these are indeed promising signs. But they must be understood. (H. M. Enzensberger 1974a [1968], 85)

In contrast, Buch and the early stages of *Literaturmagazin*, as I have shown, represent a different branch of Marxist thought. As mentioned earlier, Buch evaluates "art and literature as important socially productive forces that enable emancipatory fantasy."[30] Buch insists that utopian literature rather than theoretical analysis would emancipate consciousness—which is in stark contrast to Enzensberger's consciousness-raising program around 1968. We see that the aesthetic debates from the early twentieth century contributed to the eventual development of the two magazines. *Kursbuch*, in its early stages, valued literature as an important critical tool but abandoned it by 1968. *Literaturmagazin*'s founder is responding to this turn away from literature and Buch tries to revitalize art's emancipatory potential.

[30] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* from Hans Christoph Buch and Jürgen Manthey from 14.02.1973.

Most importantly, even these brief comparisons between the Marxist aesthetics of these two important editors of the postwar era refute too-simple assertions of a "new beginning" or "Zero Hour" for postwar intellectuals. While *Group 47* was defining West German literature as a newly emergent literature in Europe, these leftist debates were re-launching and re-situating important debates about the relation of literature, critique, and the "realism" of literature that had defined intellectual engagement with social and political consciousness raising since the early twentieth century. Whether that literature be formally innovative (Brecht, Buch) or realistic (Lukács, Enzensberger) in exercising critique would not be resolved.

Group 47 sought to restore a democratic spirit by stripping down language itself to remove traces of the Nazi-era in literature as expressing an essential part of the German nation—a claim I will problematize further in my conclusion. However, for the editors of *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*, that was a bourgeois utopia, questionable at its very core. They instead advocated for various approaches to engaged or critical literature—echoing Marx himself that the point of critique is to *change* the world through direct reflection on it, spurred by representations challenging the status quo.

Taken together, I agree with Hohendahl that treatments of earlier Marxist aesthetic debates during the 1960s and 1970s make it evident that "absolutely no consensus obtained in the Marxist camp about essential theoretical questions such as the problem of realism, the function of art, the assessment of specific artistic means, and so on" (Hohendahl 1991, 161–2). My juxtaposition of Enzensberger's and Buch's aesthetic viewpoints and their magazines' political agendas supports that claim. And even though it is difficult if not

impossible to find a common denominator in the literary theory produced within the leftist camp in postwar West Germany, Hohendahl rightly points to literary magazines as central sites where a variety of opinions and viewpoints of Marxist and leftist arguments was developed and circulated (ibid.). I thus suggest that it is crucial for today's scholarship to look into West Germany's postwar literary magazines in order to understand how Marxist debates around and after 1968 attempted to fuse resistance against prevailing FRG politics into a counter-public sphere that could exert actual political force. That being said, I will now turn to the magazines' content examination.

To this point in my dissertation, I have been analyzing the goals and strategies held by the editors of the two magazines under consideration here, with the goal of situating them within German leftist aesthetic traditions that had existed at least since Weimar. Now, their actual achievements must be front and center to ascertain what that meant in the actual context of a readership that needed to be engaged and transformed. In the upcoming chapters 4 and 5, I will analyze the contents of the two magazines' first five years against the background of their actual published interests and their editors' opinions. I will specifically look into the themes they took up as subject of their critiques of their reality, and the genres or forms of representation that were taken up in the first years of the magazines.

The major themes and issues these two magazines decided to focus on, furthermore will demonstrate what the editors thought their assumed readership would be interested in and how they believed these readers could be engaged. Such an analysis of the content and

genre reveals the journals' approaches to transforming their readers' political consciousness, as well as to their assessment of Germany's problems and political needs.

To this point, contextualizing the two editors and their place in aesthetic discussions illustrates what Buch and Enzensberger learned from the broader history of Marxisms, including world Marxisms—by no means a model for political critique that was insular or narrowly nationalist in its appeal. By highlighting the most frequently represented issues from these journals, as we shall see, we can follow these journals into their project about building new political consciousness through reading and culture; by tracking how this is done—especially what genres are used—, we will be able to watch how the editors implemented their programs and attempted to realize their own political-critical utopias, the building of a readership critical to the emerging politics of the FRG at two great moments of its emergence. The Germany of the Economic Miracle and Adenauer's East Politics would not come off well.

A Marxist exposition of the historicity of events is not about everything that has ever happened, but about a specific trajectory underlying it—a significant *course* of events (Eagleton 2011, 35). By situating what was published in dialog to who published it at what time for what reason, I will suggest how these magazines attempted to function as critical mass media, taking seriously their project of calling out the elites of the FRG when they threatened to prolong an old order still clearly marked by Germany's Nazi heritage. What challenges they faced will be sufficiently profiled in the first five years of each publication for us to see how the editors' plans evolved into practical political and aesthetic education.

My content analyses in the next chapters focuses on two major questions: How did *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* seek to shape and redefine a literary public sphere as a site of cultural and political critique of the FRG during the *long '68*? And what is their role in the reevaluation and dissemination of different global Marxisms in postwar Germany?

Chapter 4: Remaking a Public Critique, Part I: Social Functions and Limits of Literature and Marxist Literary Criticism

To this point, I have situated *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* in their two different moments of West Germany's postwar history (chapter 1). I have then discussed the social functions and limitations of literary magazines, arguing that the periodicals under investigation differed not just in their historical moment, but also in their political agendas and attempted interventions against the FRG's literary, political, and cultural status quo (chapter 2). Understanding the difference in the magazines' efforts for political consciousness-raising subsequently led me to a discussion of their underlying ideologies, namely their differing approaches to their inherited Marxist aesthetic criticism and the twentieth-century intellectual debates associated with it (chapter 3). In other words, I have moved from the historical contexts to the individual intellectual biographies of the journals' initial editors Hans Magnus Enzensberger and Hans Christoph Buch, and then to an examination of their medium of choice, literary magazines and to an outline of their inherited aesthetic theories of consciousness-raising within the complex, unfinished, international, and contradictory field known as Marxist aesthetics.

In the present chapter and in chapter 5 below, I will analyze the contents of the two magazines' first five years against the background of their actual published interests and their editors' intentions outlined earlier.[1] In order to see how they implemented their programs, I will specifically look into the themes they took up as subjects of their critiques of their respective realities, and the genres or forms of representation that were taken up in the magazines' first years. This analysis will allow us to watch how the editors implemented their programs and attempted to realize their own political-critical visions, the building of a readership critical to the politics of the FRG at two great moments of its emergence.

What there is to analyze, however, seems potentially limitless. Niese identifies for the first *Kursbuch* years a wide range of key topics such as examinations of new social movements; Critical Theory and neo-Marxism; reflections on the "hunger for theory"; new theories from France and the so-called Third World; new feminist movements and the sexual revolution; new forms of state criticism and the intellectual's mandate; as well as cultural upheavals especially in literature, film, radio, theater, and music (2017, 41–2). The same can be said about *Literaturmagazin*. It is beyond the scope of this work to examine such a broad thematic spectrum in detail. Pursuing topics specifically related to the Marxist heritage that I have been pursing, however, charts a course through this diversity. For the two remaining chapters of my dissertation, I will therefore examine two broader themes taken up by both magazines from within Marxist theory. This choice allows me a fertile

[1] To ensure the feasibility of my analysis, I examine each magazine's publications during the first five years. This span includes the first twenty-two *Kursbuch* issues published between June 1965 and December 1970, and the first eleven *Literaturmagazin* issues published between October 1973 and November 1979. My *Kursbuch* examination excludes the "Kursbögen" (fold-out poster-sized supplements that appeared starting *Kursbuch* 15); see Niese (2013, 2017) and Schweppe (2014) for a detailed account in that regard.

comparison of how *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* did indeed constitute two different case studies at central sites where Marxist and leftist arguments were developed and circulated, two different moments in the evolving intellectual debates of the German and international Left, and, ultimately, two different and individual attempts to create Marxist debates in postwar West Germany and beyond.

In this chapter, I will contrast how both magazines discuss the social functions and limitations of literature, and to what extent Marxist criticism plays a guiding role in this regard. This first part will examine the journals' reflections on art in a rather abstract and theoretical fashion. Chapter 5 then takes this initial input and analyzes how both magazines assess the responsibilities of public intellectuals and writers toward such a critical public sphere with its possibilities and limitations of bridging Marxist theorems into political action. In both chapters, my focus will be on pertinent arguments rather than complete documentation. My ultimate goal in these two chapters is thus to show what being *leftist* meant to different groups of West German Marxists, and how magazines such as *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* attempted to create a public and critical stage for them.

The differences of approaches are immediately evident—both magazines' sets of genre choices reveal programmatic insights in themselves. Both *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* use a broad spectrum of non-documentary and documentary texts.[2] Of

[2] The differences in genre choice are more quantitative than absolutely qualitative. *Kursbuch*'s non-documentary genres include poetry, prose (mostly short stories or novel excerpts), plays, and quotes. The periodical's documentary contributions feature text genres such as essays, interviews, letter correspondences, documentary prose, reprints of speeches and presentations, reprints of letters to the editor, research reports and scientific texts, excerpts from studies, pamphlets, debate reprints, documentary polemics, commentaries, dossiers (including memoirs, diaries, notes), photo collections, legal information, mailing lists, newspaper articles, manuscripts, and questionnaires. Quite similarly, *Literaturmagazin*'s non-documentary genres include poems, prose (mostly novel excerpts and short stories), theater and radio plays,

significant difference, however, is their dissimilar balancing between non-documentary and documentary contributions. Eleven out of twenty-two *Kursbuch* issues have no fictional or non-documentary texts at all (*Kursbuch* #2, #9, #11, #12, #13, #14, #16, #17, #19, #21, and #22); and nineteen out of twenty-two publications have more documentary than non-documentary texts (the three exceptions are *Kursbuch* #3, #4, and #10). This proportion indisputably situates Enzensberger within the so-called "documentary turn," which echoes his late-1960s evaluation of non-documentary literature as socially purposeless, and it also highlights a desire for a direct and action-driven message to *Kursbuch*'s readership that straightforwardly appeals to local conditions. By contrast, all *Literaturmagazin* issues have both non-documentary and documentary genres, and only *Literaturmagazin* #7 has more documentary than non-documentary contributions. This ratio lines up with Buch's conviction that literature (not only theory) could be a socially productive force, and that utopian literature that produced new representations of society, rather than theoretical analysis critiquing them, would emancipate consciousness (see chapter 3).

The thumbnail of genre use above already illustrates how *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* are imbedded not only in different historical moments, but also in their initial editors' intellectual stance on Marxist aesthetics. I will now examine further differences and tensions between both magazines, beginning with a selection of representative contributions concerning the political and social possibilities and limitations

---

song texts with notes, and quotes. The journal's documentary text genres are essays, correspondences, interviews, excerpts from Marxist theoretical texts, sections with photos of sculptures and paintings, commentaries, dossiers, newspaper articles, speeches, diary excerpts, autobiographies, and memoirs.

of literature. This comparison illustrates how the editors' clashing Marxist viewpoints are reflected in their journal's aesthetic choices, which are in themselves appropriations of Marxist aesthetics grounded in the earlier Marxist debates outlined in chapter 3.

THE AESTHETICS OF STAGING HISTORY: FROM DOSSIERS TO BRECHT IN *KURSBUCH*

As I have illustrated in chapter 2, Enzensberger emphasized in planning the first *Kursbuch* issue the importance of including original documents such as legal protocols, hearings, shorthand reports, etc., a choice which typifies his intention to go beyond the "limits" of a purely literary magazine.[3] These so-called *dossier* sections were, however, intended to be "a new political-literary dimension" through which the *Kursbuch* founder and his co-editor Michel envisioned directly influencing their readerships' consciousness (Niese 2017, 133–4). By making this choice, they not only situated themselves within the *zeitgeist* of the "documentary turn" of the 1960s (see chapter 3). They also, as the *Kursbuch* dossiers reveal, were essential in the journal's aesthetic approach to Marxism, which, as I shall outline in this chapter, differs from *Literaturmagazin*'s angle, highlighting both journal's complex and sophisticated set of Marxisms around 1968.

Before I turn to the first *Kursbuch* issue that deals explicitly with aesthetic themes, it is crucial to contextualize how its dossier section was intended to anchor the aesthetic impact of its contents historically, by explicitly having the magazine engaged with

[3] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 07.07.1964: "ich überlege mir, ob wir nicht in der ersten nummer des kursbuchs ein dossier darüber vorlegen sollten. (ich wähle den ausdruck dossier, statt 'dokumentation', und meine damit was ich im brief angedeutet habe, prozeß-protokolle, hearings, stenogramme aller art, realitäts-stenogramme, gelegentlich eben auch polemiken, und zwar gebündelte. ein solches dossier sollte in jeder nummer stehen.)"

contemporaneous events. The 1960s marked a critical turning point in the continuing silence about the Holocaust, starting in 1961 in Jerusalem with the trial of one of the principal architects of the Holocaust: Adolf Eichmann (1906–62). On the FRG side, the German awareness and acknowledgment of the Holocaust became increasingly public through the Eichmann trial along with the Frankfurt Auschwitz trials in Frankfurt/Main from 1963–5 (Schlant 1999, 19). These prosecutions brought "a new centrality to the eyewitness testimony of the survivors and their stories" and "proved to be the beginning of a shift in Holocaust consciousness" (Bos 2014, 409–10). In brief, the 1960s provoked a degree of public controversy that emphasizes the general knowledge of the Holocaust but also the conflicted and unresolved attitude in confronting it (Schlant 1999, 19).

The first *Kursbuch* issue from June 1965—from the beginning faithful to pick up contemporaneous discussions—ends with a dossier on the Frankfurt Auschwitz trials, a conscious engagement with its moment in a kind of written montage that opened out the news through different kinds of writing about it. One contribution by German writer Peter Weiss (1916–82) is a report he wrote in 1964 while attending the Frankfurt Auschwitz trials. His protocol of those sessions cites statements by Nazi criminals such as Robert Mulka (1895–1969), Wilhelm Boger (1906–77), Josef Klehr (1904–88), or Bruno Schlage (1903–77), who all rejected responsibility for their crimes, arguing they only did what they were told by the NS regime (P. Weiss 1965, 152). The documentation of former Nazis rejecting responsibility for their crimes is also the topic of the second dossier contribution by German writer Martin Walser (1927–), entitled "Our Auschwitz." Here, Walser criticizes bourgeois society, especially its egoism and hegemonic media; what bothers him

most is the individualistic, indeed, anarchic, consciousness of bourgeois Germans that seemingly permits a distancing from the Holocaust (Moses 2007, 255). Walser states:

> Our memory gets filled with cruelties. And the more terrible the Auschwitz quotes are, the clearers becomes our distance to Auschwitz. We know for sure that we have nothing to do with these atrocities. […] The trial is not about us. That is why the accused are being called "devils" and "executioners" and "predators." Who among us is a devil, an executioner, a predator? Such a distance is a suitable way to look at Auschwitz. Well, in this way, Auschwitz even becomes a sad form of attraction.[4]

Even though the first *Kursbuch* dossier on the Frankfurt Auschwitz trials does not explicitly deal with the politicized literature as an aesthetic, I include it, as it exemplifies the magazine's Marxist standpoints theoretically as well as aesthetically.

Aesthetically, the magazine uses montage technique to re-stage realities that have been somehow sanitized in the press. Politically, the result is a direct counterconvention of the "official" line about the criminals tried at Frankfurt. Peter Weiss and Martin Walser link the Holocaust to capitalism rather than to anti-Semitism (Moses 2007, 255). They hold the German population less criminally culpable than misled and betrayed by corrupt elites and argue that the technocratic and capitalist system that had wrought Auschwitz is now running the FRG (ibid.). Such an argumentation echoes the thinking of Frankfurt School

[4] Unless otherwise noted, all English translations are my own. Original German quote: "So ist unser Gedächtnis jetzt angefüllt mit Furchtbarem. Und je furchtbarer die Auschwitz-Zitate sind, desto deutlicher wird ganz von selbst unsere Distanz zu Auschwitz. Mit diesen Geschehnissen, das wissen wir gewiß, mit diesen Scheußlichkeiten haben wir nichts zu tun. [...] In diesem Prozeß ist nicht von uns die Rede. Nicht umsonst werden die Angeschuldigten in den Berichten 'Teufel' und 'Henker' und 'Raubtiere' genannt. Wer von uns ist schon ein Teufel, ein Henker, ein Raubtier. Tatsächlich, auf diese Distanz gebracht, läßt sich Auschwitz betrachten. Ja, Auschwitz bringt es sogar zu einer traurigen Art von Attraktion" (Walser 1965, 190).

members such as Max Horkheimer and Franz Neumann during the 1930s and 1940s, who viewed fascism as an outgrowth of capitalism moving from its liberal to its monopoly stage (Bronner and Kellner 1989, 7). On a theoretical level, unmasking fascism as the "terroristic organization of the capitalist contradictions" (Marcuse 1972, 28) is quite significant for contemporaneous *Kursbuch* readers due to its relevance for their present moment. In essence, it stresses that the FRG's integration into Western capitalism bears in itself a fascist potential that reinforces German fascist history, and that Marxist anti-capitalist theory is necessary for any praxis-oriented anti-fascist struggle. The German fascist past will not be overcome unless capitalism is also put into a trial dock. But how this praxis-oriented brawl ought to be taken out on an aesthetic level, is a different question—how is this dossier intended to be read, given that it is important enough to be part of the first issue of a new engaged periodical?

In terms of literature's duties and possibilities in such struggle, Enzensberger seems to suggest that documentary texts, as found in the dossier sections, can be best utilized for generating critical consciousness. Yet this also implies that more artistic and poetic texts appear to be evaluated as counterproductive and even need to be edited for the sake of guided purposefulness in the process of consciousness transformation. That assumption is confirmed by reports on how the editors handled submissions. For example, despite its documentary style, Weiss wanted his dossier contribution to be a poetic report on the trials, of the sort that would appear in 1965 as *The Investigation: Oratorio in 11 Cantos*. But Enzensberger and Michel edited the text against that aim, which made Weiss even file a complaint to *Suhrkamp* manager Siegfried Unseld (Niese 2017, 134). This editorial

intervention illustrates, on an aesthetic level, how *Kursbuch*'s focus was geared towards objective intervention rather than poetic openness, leading its way eventually to its espousal of the *Death of Literature* thesis in 1968, ultimately fitting what I have called Marxist "realism 2.0" (chapter 3).

Hence, *Kursbuch* had a Marxist program from its first issue and a strong vision of how an agenda might function aesthetically—as a montage rather than a poetic opening of the system. Part of the discussion above about Marxist "realism 2.0," we remember, was the *Realism-Modernism Debate* concerning aesthetic dogmatism and literary political engagement. As outlined in chapter 3, two main contributors to that dispute were Georg Lukács and Bertolt Brecht. As stated earlier, large parts of Brecht's theoretical work on Marxist aesthetics had gradually become accessible in the 1960s (Cohen 1997, 1175). Not surprisingly, then, Enzensberger included a reassessment of the dispute between Lukács and Brecht and its significance for a reexamination of politized literature and literary criticism in his magazine. Enzensberger was interested in confronting his audiences, as was Brecht.

This debate—and Brecht—will resonate throughout the early editions of *Kursbuch*. In *Kursbuch* #7 (September 1966), Swiss playwright and novelist Max Frisch (1911–91) published a remembrance of his old acquaintance Brecht. Faithful to *Kursbuch*'s Marxist "realism 2.0," Frisch asserts that Brecht's literary judgments were grounded in political frustration and classified texts not according to categories such as *great* or *masterly*, but

important.[5] Such a taxonomy stresses the political function of literature and discredits the idea of art for art's sake. Frisch asserts that Marxist theory was crucial for Brecht's work because stage-plays and poems needed to be written as levers to change the world. According to Frisch, it was Marxist theory that saved the artist Brecht from bare anarchist nonconformity.[6]

It is necessary to keep in mind who is talking about whom. Brecht died over a decade before Frisch gave him this particular Marxist voice. As stated in chapter 3, such positions on philosophy, literature, or theory have in themselves little imminent meaning and need to be contextualized in their form and context to apprehend the consciousness of those involved (Sepp 2019, 218). In this case, we must remember that Frisch's *Brecht appropriation* is in itself also a *Marx appropriation*—a response to a historical situation and an indication of a psychological need. Brecht served *Kursbuch* in a specific way, as Frisch's appropriation demonstrates. Unlike Lukács with his fondness for nineteenth-century literature, Brecht rejected the former's literary and theoretical nostalgia as utopian idealism. Enzensberger himself would later criticize Lukács for his "theoretical and practical backwardness" (1974b [1970], 120). Brecht, in Frisch's interpretation for Enzensberger's magazine, diagnosed the meaningless of art unless it was aiming for

[5] Original German quote: "Literarische Urteile von Brecht? [...] Meistens war es politischer Zorn, der ihm ein literarisches Urteil entlockte [...] Die Vokabel war dann nicht: großartig, meisterhaft; sondern: wichtig" (Frisch 1966, 57).

[6] Original German quote: "Er brauchte Theorie: als Axt immerzu, um nicht wie die Leute des Cortez (in seinem Gedicht) elendiglich verschlungen zu werden von der Natur. Er [Brecht] fand, was er brauchte, im Marxismus. Daß man Stücke schreibe oder Gedichte, um die Welt zu verändern, daran schien Brecht zu glauben; es setzt keinen Zweifel in die Ernsthaftigkeit seines politischen Engagements [...] Brecht ohne Marxismus? Es war der entscheidende Akt, der den Anarchisten rettete als Artist, damit er nicht im bloßen Nonkonformismus degenerierte" (Frisch 1966, 75).

political change—a thought that, as we shall see, will radicalize itself in *Kursbuch*'s future editorial process.

I argue that the *Brecht appropriation* found in *Kursbuch*, however, resembles theoretical cherry-picking rather than a thorough, detailed discussion of Brecht's various aesthetic and political agendas. As outlined in chapter 3, Brecht knew that any dogmatic adherence to Marxist programs of any kind would undermine its own theory. He demanded new literary techniques that engage with their specific period. Brecht advocated experimental and innovative art, not normative aesthetic claims, when he said: "we must interrogate reality about literary forms, not aesthetics" (2003 [1954], 227). As we will see in the following sections, *Kursbuch*'s editorial dogmatism was way behind Brecht's claims.

In the same *Kursbuch* #7 issue, German dramaturge Klaus Völker (1938–) continues to discredit Lukács's aesthetic work while praising Brecht. Völker accuses the Hungarian Marxist of focusing on artistry rather than political change (1966, 85). We again see here *Kursbuch*'s reoccurring theme of West German leftists discrediting art as useless unless it directly advocates a radical transformative agenda. But we now have an additional layer to that rejection: the Cold War may have caused the contempt of many FRG Marxists towards Lukács, who in the mid-1960s was living somewhat comfortably east of the Iron Curtain, and who was often perceived as being part of the totalitarian East bloc regime.[7] On that note, Völker does not shy away from pointing out an apparent "dangerous accordance of fascist and socialist art conception as found in Lukács" (ibid., 94). Lukács's

[7] Discrediting Lukács's theoretical achievements is, by all means, not limited to the early twentieth-century modernists or the 1960s New Left. Especially scholars widely read in the English-speaking world, such as Gareth Stedman Jones (1942–), Leszek Kołakowski (1927–2009), and George Lichtheim (1912–73), also condemned Lukács's Marxist theories as irrationalist and even Stalinist (Feenberg 2014 [1981], xv).

dangerous aesthetic, he suggests, is the preliminary theory for the "final damnation of all progressive tendencies in literature" (ibid., 97), since it claims that *the* people can be adequately represented in literature's representational dialogics, without necessarily calling for transformation.

Brecht, by contrast, was presumably perceived by many West German Marxists as a dissident against Eastern bloc viciousness, despite publicly being "a staunch defender of communism and of the German communist state" (Thomson 2006, 239)—it was familiar that he never gave up his Austrian passport. However, some of his works, such as his 1953 poem "Die Lösung" [The Solution] accused the East German regime of "failing to represent the real People" during the 1953 East German workers' uprising (Newey 2009, 90). And while unpublished in the GDR, the FRG based newspaper *Die Welt* [The World] made "The Solution" accessible to a West German audience in 1959, which could explain a reignited fondness for Brecht by anti-Soviet West German leftists. Völker appears to be a West German example how Brecht was affirmed at this point. He ends his article by stating that Brecht, unlike Lukács, was committed to political praxis and that he put action-driven engagement rather than aesthetic contemplation in the key position of his aesthetics. Lukács's struggle, by contrast, was not against fascism but decadence, hence counterproductive for any Marxist agenda.[8]

[8] Original German quote: "Brecht war dem Realismus und der politischen Praxis mehr verpflichtet als Lukács, dessen Festhalten an alten Formen nur zum Verweilen in höheren ästhetischen Regionen einlud. [...] Mit Marxismus hat seine Methode kaum etwas gemein. Gegenüber der politischen Realität von 1938 verhielt sich Lukács fremd und dogmatisch. Er forderte nicht den Kampf gegen den Faschismus, sondern gegen die Dekadenz" (Völker 1966, 98).

The *Brecht appropriation* found in Frisch and Völker signifies *Kursbuch*'s partiality toward Brecht over Lukács. "Resolving" the *Realism-Modernism Debate* in favor of an engaged conception of art with the sole purpose of supporting political action fits into the New Left's *zeitgeist* of the 1960s. The insistence on the dossiers as a kind of montage fostering critical thinking into existence is a more active approach to Marxist consciousness-raising because montages require active reading, while even the most critical of representations can simply be consumed. As I will examine in the following section, however, *Literaturmagazin* will free itself from this bias in the early 1970s.

THE HISTORY OF POLITICAL AESTHETICS IN *LITERATURMAGAZIN*

Committed to critical Marxist dialectics and in contrast to Enzensberger, *Literaturmagazin* editor Buch decided not to pick a "side" or try to "resolve" the *Realism-Modernism Debate*.[9] Moving away from Enzensberger, Buch declared: "Socialist literature needs both Brecht *and* Lukács, […] because there are lessons to learn from both" (1973,

[9] Marxism used in its dialectical form examines socially critical categories and analyses as fundamentally historical and in need of development and revision as historical conditions change (Kellner 1989, 6). Dialectics is the study of contradictions in the essence of objects (the Thing-in-Itself), which reveals the transitory, mobile, and fluid nature not only of the object's essence but also of its appearance (the Being-for-Others) (Lenin 1976 [1915], 251–2). In other words, the inner connectedness of contradictions that moves an entity has to be abstracted from it, discovered within it, while not being imposed upon it (Michael-Matsas 2008, 174). The revolutionary potential of dialectics lies in its possibility to challenge the "Now-Moment" by uncovering its contradictions and consequently allowing room for its negation (ibid., 165). This dialectical method, itself being historically situated, has to develop itself further *dialectically*, too. As mentioned earlier, Marx himself knew that his theory was not a *supra-historic* principle that could be applied to any period or the whole history of human society without a previous investigation of the actual historical facts (Korsch 2016 [1938], 121). It thus cannot take its departure from a preconceived and dogmatic principle, even less so because the science of Marx is a *critical* rather than a *positive* one (ibid., 121–2).

37). The key for Buch is not just that literature has to be engaged, but that literature also has to be involved with itself—it must actively look for ways to represent the world in ways that demand engagement with the naturalized political ideologies that sponsor the very tools of representation.

It is thus no accident that Buch starts *Literaturmagazin* #1 (October 1973) with an excerpt from Lukács's 1939 essay "The Writer and the Critic."[10] In this essay, Lukács turns the familiar narrative of how criticism examines capitalism upside down and analyzes, dialectically, how capitalism influences criticism. He asserts that, once capitalists discover that opposition in the art world can be a profitable speculation, "these movements find their Maecenases [*sic*] and suffer the dubious financial and moral consequence of capitalist underwriting" (1971c [1939], 195). Even critique, then, is subject to being coopeted by the forces of capitalism. Literary critics in capitalism, the Hungarian Marxist argues, would "undergo a prostitution of opinion" and, despite being "gifted, cultured[,] and incorruptible critics," will eventually be absorbed and utilized by capitalist interests (ibid.). Based on the works of Nassehi (2003) and Sepp (2019), I have argued in chapter 3 that theory and criticism need to be contextualized to understand the specific purposes they serve, which might go beyond the theory or criticism itself. That being said, Buch ends his excerpt of Lukács's essay with the latter's assertion that magazines also apply criticism for their own causes:

> Then, too, as we have already noted, since some capitalists are interested in particular movements in modern literature and art, periodicals seek critics who will

[10] *Literaturmagazin* published Lukács's essay in German. The English translation is taken from *Writer & Critic and Other Essays* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1971).

> support these movements out of personal conviction. The more dedicated, talented[,] and cultivated the critic, the more effectively he can serve these interests. (1971c [1939], 195)

Buch achieves at least three objectives by printing this excerpt of Lukács's essay on the very first page of the very first *Literaturmagazin*. First, it is the direct expression of Buch's aim as was stated in his journal's call for submissions: "The magazine's first issue should begin with a critique of literary criticism."[11] Second, it is a dialectical call for self-reflexivity and self- historicization on the part of the literary establishment itself, as the periodical calls itself to be aware of its status as a magazine that is also implementing biased criticism and theory towards a specific goal. And third, it breaks with the 1960s categorical and unreflective condemnation of Lukács's work as found in *Kursbuch*.

Taking Lukács's essay as the opening for his argument, Buch, as so many times before (see chapter 1), then turns his critical attention to West Germany's New Left. The *Literaturmagazin* founder starts his own *Literaturmagazin* #1 essay, "Rot, röter, am rötesten—Gegen den Vulgärmarxismus in der Literaturkritik" [Red, Redder, Reddest—Against Vulgar-Marxism in Literary Criticism], with the following quote by Engels:

> The whole of history must be studied anew, and the existential conditions of the various social formation individually investigated before an attempt is made to deduce therefrom the political, legal, aesthetic, philosophical, religious, etc., standpoints that correspond to them. (2010 [1890], 8)[12]

---

[11] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* from Hans Christoph Buch and Jürgen Manthey from 14.02.1973: "Das erste Heft soll mit einer Kritik der Literaturkritik beginnen."

[12] *Literaturmagazin* published Engels's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *Marx & Engels: Collected Works, Volume 49: Letters 1890–92* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2010).

To paraphrase Engels in the sense of this current chapter: Marxist aesthetics should be derived from dialectical thinking, not used as an unreflective and ahistorical actionism that simply calls for change. Buch's essay follows this exhortation and critically examines typical New Left literary theories around "1968," with a focus on their aesthetic "nonsense," as the *Literaturmagazin* editor calls it (1973, 24). He claims that, between 1968 and 1972, the New Left has come up with three aesthetic strategies, all of which would be undialectical: they either try to abolish literature, they romanticize 1920s–30s proletarian-revolutionary literature, or they demand an indoctrinating and propagandistic conception of art.[13]

As a case study for his assertions, Buch examines the literary theory of the KSV (*Kommunistischer Studentenverband* [Communist Student Association]), an academic sub-organization of the KPD-AO (*Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands – Aufbauorganisation* [Communist Party of Germany – Organizational Structure]).[14] Such theoretical "1968" and post-"1968" efforts, Buch argues, are undialectical attempts to transfer communist struggles from the 1920s and 1930s into the 1970s, detached from the historical conditions of their effectiveness or failure: "What ended as a tragedy in the 1930s, becomes a farce in the 1970s; the empty rhetoric signalizes a complete waiving of social and political analysis."[15]

---

[13] Original German quote: "Von dem Ruf nach Abschaffung der Kunst über die sozialromantische Verklärung der proletarisch-revolutionären Literatur der 20er und 30er Jahre bis zur Aufforderung an westdeutsche Künstler und Schriftsteller, sich die Peking-Oper zum Vorbild zu nehmen, wurden zwischen 1968 und 72 keinerlei praktikable Vorschläge unterbreitet" (Buch 1973, 24).

[14] Note that the KPD-AO, founded in 1970 as a Maoist K-Group (see chapter 1), was not the same as the KPD (Communist Party of Germany), which was banned in 1956.

[15] Original German quote: "[...] es ist der krampfhafte Versuch, das Pathos und die Parolen der KPD der 20er und 30er Jahre, losgelöst von den Bedingungen ihres Kampfes, auf die Gegenwart zu übertragen. [...]

Buch criticizes how the KSV reduces literature to political propaganda (ibid., 29)—a critique that, as I will show below, could also apply to *Kursbuch*'s #15 issue from 1968. By doing so, he is also claiming that an author would become nothing but a party or union secretary, which would deprive art of its actual political and subversive potential (ibid., 33)—a clear dig at the "Party Programs" sent out by the USSR to its client states, including the GDR. The *Literaturmagazin* founder states that such an engaged literary dogmatism resembles mechanic idealism rather than dialectical materialism: "praxis does not determine the validity of thought, but fetishized theory. The primary experience of reality is replaced by its ideological substrate; consciousness replaces Being."[16] In contrast to such dogmatic mechanical implementations of programmatically designed aesthetics, Buch stresses literature's utopian potential. Instead of being incarcerated by Reality, he argues that utopian literature can transcend its own formative conditions and thus operate beyond the present.[17] Such a "subversive utopian force," he asserts, cannot be generated by reducing literature to an "illustration of party programs" (ibid., 31).

Thus, Buch agrees with Marcuse (see chapter 3) that the political potential of art is not grounded in the political sphere, but in art's aesthetic forms, which becomes

---

Was in den 30er Jahren als Tragödie endete, wird in den 70er Jahren zur Farce; die leerlaufende Rhetorik signalisiert den völligen Verzicht auf eine soziale und politische Analyse; die revolutionäre Gestik ist zur Karikatur erstarrt" (Buch 1973, 27).

[16] Original German quote: "Die Parteilinie wird zum schematischen Ersatz für die Wirklichkeit; an die Stelle des dialektischen Materialismus tritt ein mechanischer Idealismus; nicht die Praxis entscheidet über die Richtigkeit des Denkens, sondern eine zum Fetisch erhobene Theorie. Die primäre Wirklichkeitserfahrung wird verdrängt durch ihr ideologisches Substrat; das Bewußtsein ersetzt das Sein" (ibid., 33).

[17] Original German quote: "Der Spiegel, den die Kunst der Wirklichkeit vorhält, kann klar oder trüb sein, sie kann der Wirklichkeit vorauseilen oder hinter ihr herhinken. Gerade die utopische Funktion der Literatur, ihre Fähigkeit, ihre Entstehungsbedingungen zu transzendieren, über die Gegenwart hinauszuwirken [...] wird von den KSV-Leuten geleugnet, ja energisch bekämpft" (ibid., 30).

political by transcending the political, and, by doing so, subverting the consciousness and ordinary experience that have become reified in inherited forms and genres and that reproduce older forms of consciousness (Marcuse 1978 [1977], ix). This embeddedness of Buch's position within Marcuse's aesthetic theory is neither my creation nor implicit, but rather made explicit by Buch. The *Literaturmagazin* founder stresses the desirability of literature's subversive potential with the following quote from Marcuse's *Counterrevolution and Revolt*, published in the year before *Literaturmagazin* #1:

> There is no work of art which does not break its affirmative stance by the "power of the negative," which does not, in its very structure, evoke the words, the images, the music of another reality, of another order repelled by the existing one and yet alive in memory and anticipation, alive in what happens to men and women, and in their rebellion against it. (1972, 92)[18]

As we can see, Buch's main criticism is what he considers an aesthetic-theoretical shortcoming within the New Left—a mechanical replacement of dialectics with an oversimplified principle of causality (1973, 28).

By referencing the anti-dogmatic Italian Marxist Antonio Labriola (1843–1904), Buch explicitly criticizes the 1968ers and their descendants in another way for treating ethics, art, religion, science, etc., solely as products of economic conditions. Buch quotes the following passage from Labriola's *Historical Materialism*:

> What a delight for all careless persons to possess, once for all, summed up in a few propositions, the whole of knowledge, and to be able with one single key to

[18] *Literaturmagazin* published Marcuse's quote in German. The quote above is taken from the original English version *Counterrevolution and Revolt* (Boston: Beacon, 1972).

> penetrate all the secrets of life! All the problems of ethics, æsthetics [*sic*], philology, critical history[,] and philosophy reduced to one single problem and freed thus from all difficulties! (1908 [1896], 204)[19]

Taken together, Buch suggests instead a dialectical approach to literature and rejects any normative claims to it. As mentioned above, the question for the *Literaturmagazin* founder is not realism *or* modernism, Lukács *or* Brecht, because such a dichotomy itself results in undialectical one-sidedness: "Socialist literature needs both Brecht *and* Lukács" (1973, 37).

The *Literaturmagazin* founder asserts instead that the theoretical work of the New Left has becomes more useless the more it has become constrained in the mechanical dogmatism of a single, economic model at the basis of group consciousness (ibid., 38). This lack of dialectics—of a principle of self-critique rather than solidarity with a single strategy of opposition—will ultimately open the possibility of capitalist exploitation, as foreseen in Lukács's essay "The Writer and the Critic." Buch concludes:

> The capitalist commodity economy, which profits even from its own abolition, marches into Marxist theory: capitalism's hostility towards art rediscovers itself in an ultra-left pseudo-Marxist theory; their [New Left's] consumption behavior towards works of art resembles the stereotypical question of art's usefulness, which unconsciously reproduces the bourgeois principle of profit maximization.[20]

---

[19] *Literaturmagazin* published Labriola's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *Essays on the Materialist Conception of History* (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, 1908).

[20] Original German quote: "Die kapitalistische Warenwirtschaft, die noch aus ihrer Abschaffung Profit schlägt, hält auch in die marxistische Theorie Einzug: die Kunstfeindlichkeit des Kapitalismus kehrt, pseudo-marxistisch fundiert, in den Theorien der Ultralinken wieder; ihr Konsumverhalten gegenüber

Before turning my attention to two more *Kursbuch* issues, let me establish a baseline for the aesthetic principles that are at play in this decade-long separation between Enzensberger and Buch that has been argued with Lukács as their proxy.

If we go back to my overriding argument that *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* represent a multilayered set of Marxist interpretations around 1968, then we can examine their theoretical tensions about how to generate a public space for progressive leftism and thereby open a window into the era's left-wing debates. When Buch criticizes the New Left's aesthetic "nonsense" between 1968 and 1972 (1973, 24), his assessment includes *Kursbuch*. In the following sections, I will analyze how *Kursbuch*'s conceptions of literature and literary theory ended up being perceived as nonsensical by the *Literaturmagazin* founder, beginning with the impactful *Kursbuch* #15 from November 1968.

Remember that these arguments were not made in a vacuum. Before November 1968, events in Germany and beyond had already snowballed: West Berlin-based student protester Benno Ohnesorg was killed over a year earlier in 1967, exactly one week before Jürgen Habermas accused Hans-Jürgen Krahl, Rudi Dutschke, and their followers of "left fascism." By April 1968, soon to be RAF members Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin started to terrorize the FRG, and a *Springer*-reading anti-communist shot Dutschke. One month later, the German Emergency Acts were passed at the same time as the student protests in France escalated in an unprecedented fashion, all while the Prague Spring was being crushed by Eastern Bloc military's tanks rolling into Prague—just to name a few

---

Kunstwerken spiegelt sich in der stereotypen Frage nach deren Nutzeffekt, die das bürgerliche Prinzip der Profitmaximierung unbewußt reproduziert" (Buch 1973, 38).

events.[21] There thus was a growing dissent within the East Bloc, one which might have fostered a new generation of Marxist aesthetics (an example of which might be the East German call for an *Ankunftsliteratur* [Literature of Arrival], a literature of, by, and for the maturing socialist citizens of the East, rather than one hewing to the line of USSR Writers' Union aesthetics).[22]

In the months after the publication of *Kursbuch* #15, students continued occupying seminars at German universities, organized sit-ins, and increasingly radicalized themselves. If we understand *Kursbuch* not just as "the main public forum for the student movement" (Dirke 1997, 47), but also as a Hegelian *child of its philosophical time* (Hegel 2003 [1821], 21–2), a closer look at its November 1968 issue reveals the revolt's aesthetic conception as well as Buch's scorn for it in retrospect.

As outlined in chapter 2, *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* were not that different in their intentions. In essence, both journals started with the same premise—the rejection of West Germany's literary scene as inadequate to the critique of the FRG. Both tried to create a counter-public sphere to enable responses to their different historical contexts, and both chose literary magazines as their platforms. And going back to my overarching argument, both magazines are two examples of how Marxist criticism was conceived, used, disseminated, and transformed in the postwar FRG.

---

[21] See chapter 1 for a more detailed historical background.
[22] In essence, the idea of *Ankunftsliteratur* was that of a voluntary "arrival" of eager young socialists in East Germany, keen to help build a "new society" (Grange 2009, 70).

INVENTING NEW POLITICAL AESTHETICS

Comparing *Kursbuch* #15 and *Literaturmagazin* #1 highlights the journals' similarities and differences: both issues are committed to a critique of literary criticism, both deploy Marxism as their theoretical frameworks, and both end up with entirely different solutions to the problem of political critique using literature. *Literaturmagazin*'s approach to aesthetic criticism has just been outlined. Let me now turn my attention to what Buch criticized in particular, beginning with *Kursbuch* #15 from November 1968 as the baseline against which he needed to react.

In his "Anachronistic Polemic" in *Kursbuch* #15, German writer Yaak Karsunke (1934–) advocates a renewal of literary criticism. Whereas Buch, as stated above, saw this renewal grounded in dialectical thinking, Karsunke suggests a personnel replacement of literary critics. Those practicing "left" literary criticism, Karsunke asserts, are actually the heirs of national socialism, which in turn would be the heritage of bourgeois capitalism:

> Like in every other profession, the older generation [of critics] consists of followers, disappointed followers, inner emigrants; some renegades, a few Cold warriors – the ensemble is complete. The younger generation consists of these peoples' students.[23]

Karsunke thus contends that literary critics on the Left are not only bourgeois, capitalist, and counterrevolutionary, but furthermore also harmful to any social and political change

[23] Original German quote: "Sie sind die Erben des Nationalsozialismus, der seinerseits ein Erbe des bourgeoisen Kapitalismus war. Die ältere Generation besteht (wie in allen Berufen) aus Mitläufern, enttäuschten Mitläufern, inneren Emigranten; einige Renegaten, paar Kalte Krieger – das Ensemble ist vollständig. Die jüngere Generation besteht aus den Schülern dieser Leute" (Karsunke 1968, 166).

by spreading reactionary attitudes towards the demands of younger generations. He directs his accusation towards famous literary critics such as Marcel Reich-Ranicki (1920–2013, house critic of *Group 47*), although it is more than a questionable stretch to call Reich-Ranicki an inheritor of national socialism, given that Reich-Ranicki was a Polish-born Jew who grew up in the Warsaw Ghetto and whose parents and brother were killed by the Nazis. Be that as it may, Karsunke objects that critics such as Reich-Ranicki would falsely claim that literary criticism defends literature and, by doing so, makes its existence possible (1968, 166).

In contrast, Karsunke suggests that, under capitalism, "sales figures are critique-independent." Because of this mix of art and commerce, the FRG's literary criticism, he continues, simply reproduces the false consciousness of capitalist society in their defense of literature and thus enable the kind of literature that is exploitable by capitalist market mechanisms.[24] In other words, literary critics do not improve literature, but actually prevent the emergence of what Karsunke calls *functional literature*, i.e. a literature conscious of its own capitalist surroundings that could actually change these circumstances by fostering critical awareness about them (ibid., 167). He concludes his argumentation by quoting a pamphlet by students who occupied the German Department at West Berlin's Free University on May 27, 1968:

> The present status of German Studies assumes the role of science within the emergency state: it not only relinquishes questions concerning the social purpose

[24] Orignal German quote: "Das mit dem ermöglichten Dasein ist Geflunker: Verkaufszahlen sind kritik-unabhängig, große nackte Buchfabriken binden sich aus schlechtem Gewissen oder falschem Bewußtsein belletristische Feigenblätter vor. Modifikation: die deutsche Literaturkritik vermehrt emsig das falsche Bewußtsein, *damit* ermöglicht sie tatsächlich das Dasein *dieser* Literatur" (ibid., 167).

and effectiveness of social praxis, but it also arranges [critical] praxis in a way that such questions will not even occur.[25]

Taken together, Karsunke seems to imply that literary critics (consciously or unconsciously) conspire with the capitalist literary market and advocate reactionary literature designed to prevent political action. He thus argues that only by replacing such institutionalized critics will the contemporary literary scene give way to a new and "functional" literature, defined by its potential for political change.

In consequence, instead of seeing Marxist aesthetics as a theoretical conflict that requires renewal through dialectical thought, as suggested by Buch, Karsunke approaches aesthetic questions as a generational conflict. At the core of the generational divide is the promise that the younger generation can foment a new revolutionary praxis of literature if young leftists are simply allowed to expropriate established critical mandates to the projects of their own generation. Such a perspective would encourage the student revolutionaries to conceive of themselves as some sort of revolutionary agents, despite all contemporaneous warnings to the contrary by Buch (1968 [1967], 134–6) and Marcuse (1970a [1967], 64), as outlined in chapter 1. Moreover, and in contrast to Enzensberger and Michel, Karsunke does not deny the revolutionary potential of literature altogether—what is needed are "simply" personnel adjustments.

Let us now turn to Enzensberger's and Michel's *Kursbuch* #15 contributions, which pass more severe judgments on the "functionality" of literature, starting with

[25] Orignal German quote: "Der gegenwärtige Zustand der Germanistik nimmt die Rolle der Wissenschaft im Notstandsstaat vorweg: nicht nur Verzicht zu leisten auf die Frage nach dem gesellschaftlichen Sinn und der Wirksamkeit gesellschaftlicher Praxis, sondern die Praxis so einzurichten, daß die Frage gar nicht erst aufkommt" (ibid.).

Michel's essay "A Wreath for Literature." Just as in Enzensberger's 1962 essay "The Aporias of the Avant-Garde" (see chapter 3), Michel takes a committed stance toward what I have called anti-modernist Marxist "realism 2.0." He argues that, while avant-garde literature might have been progressive concerning its form, its contents are far removed from social reality (Dirke 1997, 60). Such a tendency toward abstraction, according to Michel, automatically results in a literature characterized by social purposelessness. He asserts that such literature has "a high degree of redundancy" while its "information value is minimal" (1968, 171). In contrast to Buch's and Marcuse's positions outlined above, then, Michel does not grant literature any ability to transcend its material existence. In fact, the idea of literature's purported transcendence is for him part of the problem that removes the social force of literary productions. If they espouse this idea, writers and their audiences would succumb to what he considers a *flawed illusion* by attesting a "higher Reality" to literature's unreality and fiction.[26] Michel's scorn for any concept of representation of Reality that models literature as somehow leading beyond immediate Reality will sell out art's utopian potential as advocated by Buch and Marcuse. That difference also once again situates *Kursbuch* within the documentary turn of the 1960s, stressing the need for realist and documentary aesthetics.

Writers, Michel suggests, are part of bourgeois society's superstructure, while the literary intelligentsia perceives itself as the *Über-Ich* [Super-Ego] of that society (ibid.,

[26] Original German quote: "Darin liegt das Dilemma der heutigen Literatur. Ihr 'Spruch' ist ein Luxus, etwas für den Sonntag (für die Feuilleton-Seite, das Abendstudio, das Literaturseminar), aber er will die Realität treffen; er vermittelt die Illusion, Realität nicht nur zu deuten, sondern auch zu bedeuten. Dieser Illusion erliegen die Literaten und ihr engeres Publikum gerade dank der Tatsache, daß sie ja wissen, wie sehr sie es mit Irrealem, mit Fiktion, Schein, Spiel zu tun haben, und ihm deshalb die höhere Wirklichkeit, den höheren Ernst attestieren" (Michel 1968, 174).

174).[27] In other words, poets are actually reproducing society's dominant ideologies (as part of the superstructure) under the guidance of literary critics (representing society's Super-Ego), and art itself cannot transcend these confining circumstances. Consequently, literature would do nothing but reproducing the bourgeois-capitalist status quo.

For Michel, art in late capitalism is a "social privilege" marked by its "distance to social praxis" (ibid., 177). It would only satisfy the intellectual's interest while pretending that this interest would be a social one (ibid., 179). But detached from social reality, literature for Michel becomes nothing but a luxurious commodity suitable only for a newspaper's feuilleton page or the academic literary seminar. Consequently, artists have no social authority either, especially with respect to contemporary topics (ibid., 174). By taking the example of *Group 47*, the *Kursbuch* co-editor suggests that such literary critics are of absolutely no help to the student revolutionaries or the struggle for political change.[28]

In his final assessment, therefore, writers and critics are therefore not only reactionary but rather counterrevolutionary—the literature they produce and critique cannot transform consciousness, as *Literaturmagazin* and Buch insisted. The students' revolt is for Michel a "sulky activism" responding to both modern literature and the Frankfurt School's Critical Theory since both frameworks fail to deliver guidance for

---

[27] The Super-Ego is that part of Sigmund Freud's (1856–1939) psychical apparatus in which a social authority influences the seemingly controlled and voluntary movement of the Ego (Freud 2003 [1940], 176–7).

[28] Original German quote: "Was Westdeutschland betrifft, so weiß man spätestens seit Ostern dieses Jahres, daß die als Hort aller Unzufriedenheit, als Born der Zersetzung verschrieene Gruppe 47 nicht einmal ein Papiertiger ist, sondern ein Schoßhund. Die Gruppe hat den rebellierenden Studenten weder Stichwörter geliefert noch Beifall gespendet" (Michel 1968, 177).

political praxis.[29] While literature was once a political opposition that unmasked injustices, Michel suggests that, in late capitalism, it ultimately proved itself of being incapable of stopping wrongs—instead, it rather accelerates them.[30] Taken together, Michel advocates political action over political literature, considering the latter as outdated for *Kursbuch*'s Marxist agenda. He concludes: "the world can no longer be poeticized, it can only be changed" (ibid., 185)—a twist of Marx's famous claim: "philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it" (1978d [1888], 145).

Enzensberger's essay in *Kursbuch* #15, entitled "Commonplaces on the Newest Literature," makes a very similar argument that sets his program apart from Buch's.[31] By borrowing the "Newest Literature" phrase from the Enlightenment dramaturge Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–81), the *Kursbuch* founder celebrates Lessing's push to change literature in the eighteenth century in order to address political "commonplaces of new literature" around 1968 (Schweppe 2014, 139).

Enzensberger echoes Michel's claim about the elitist status of literature and its social detachment from the broad mass of the population. Even in purportedly modernist-

---

[29] Original German quote: "Die *moderne* Literatur, die das Einverständnis aufsagt, sagt damit auch jeden Bezug zu einer möglichen Praxis auf. Darin konvergiert sie mit jener kritischen Theorie, deren Abstinenz von jeder Praxis nur den Ausweg in einen trotzigen Aktivismus läßt, der alle Theorie überrennt – wie in Frankfurt geschehen und anderswo auch" (ibid.).

[30] Original German quote: "[...] die Funktion der modernen deutschen Literatur der letzten zehn oder fünfzehn Jahre ist der des *Spiegel* verwandt, der lange als einzige oder eigentliche politische Opposition galt, mancherlei Mißstände aufdeckte und doch die angelaufene Entwicklung nicht bremsen konnte, vielmehr noch förderte" (ibid., 178).

[31] *Kursbuch* published Enzensberger's essay in German. The English translation is taken from *The Consciousness Industry: On Literature, Politics and the Media* (New York: Seabury, 1974).

active force, Enzensberger argues, art fails to represent young people who are yearning for social and political change because of its modernist political impotence:

> They [the masses] take about as much as notice of the death of literature, which has never gotten as far as the newsstand, as they did of its life. […] Since literature is made by the few for the few, it takes little to disturb this equilibrium. When the brightest heads between twenty and thirty are more interested in an agitation model than an "experimental text"; when they prefer to use faktographs [*sic*] to picaresque novels; when they sneer at literature, both its production and consumption—these are indeed promising signs. (1974a [1968], 84–5)

Enzensberger and Michel distinguish themselves from Buch or Marcuse in their assumption that material conditions ultimately trump metaphysical possibilities. For the *Kursbuch* editors, literature cannot transcend itself and be a subversive political force because its existence depends materially on economic market laws. As Enzensberger puts it: "Deliver, consume; deliver, consume: that is the imperative of the market; when writers and readers notice that those who deliver are swallowed and those who swallow are delivered up, this leads to a congestion" (ibid.).

Capitalism's taming of literature, however, would not have started with the rise of late capitalism in the 1940s (see chapter 3's footnote 27). According to Enzensberger, writers and readers would rather just "suddenly understand what has always been the case" (ibid.). Enzensberger thus seems to "resolve" the aesthetics debates of his era as well as, in retrospect, the ones from earlier decades. The *Kursbuch* founder situates his

argument in the work of Walter Benjamin, in particular the latter's 1937 essay "The Author as Producer," in which Benjamin states:

> For we are faced by the fact […] that the bourgeois apparatus of production and publication can assimilate astonishing qualities of revolutionary themes, indeed, can propagate them without calling its own existence, and the existence of the class which owns it, seriously into question. […] And I further maintain that a considerable proportion of so-called left-wing literature possessed no other social function than to wring from the political situation a continuous stream of novel effects for the entertainment of the public. (1982 [1937], 262)

Because of his insistence that the "bourgeois apparatus of production and publication" is part of the foundation of all consciousness and hence not able to critique from without, Walter Benjamin continues to have a substantial impact on *Kursbuch*'s aesthetic conception, as my analysis of the journal's twentieth issue below will further illustrate.

Enzensberger's *Benjamin appropriation* is his tactic for further questioning art's justification and revolutionary potential in an all-absorbing capitalist art market. For Enzensberger, the modernist art that rose with the bourgeoisie, defined by him as "pictures on which nothing can be recognized and poems with nothing in them," would only demonstrate its "increasing incompatibility of political demand with political practice" (1974a [1968], 86–7). Noteworthy is that Enzensberger does not limit his criticism to literature but extends it to all other forms of modernist art: "All attempts so far to break out of the ghetto of cultural life and 'to reach the masses,' for example, by means of agit-prop songs and street theater, have been defeated. They proved literarily

irrelevant and politically ineffective" (ibid., 89). In essence, this invalidates all the purportedly transformative modern art movements of the twentieth century by declaring them unable to offer real alternatives to the existing orders of taste and artistic production.

Enzensberger's reckoning attests to "the political harmlessness of all literary, indeed, all artistic products," arguing that their "claim to be enlightening, their utopian surplus, their critical potential has shriveled to mere appearance" (ibid., 90–1). He thus famously concludes that "revolutionary literature does not exist," that literary works "cannot be assigned an essential social function under present conditions," and that one also "cannot find usable criteria for judging their social function," i.e. literary criticism would be as socially useless as literature itself (ibid., 92). Enzensberger traces the intellectuals' impotence "back to the production relationship of the mind industry [i.e. Consciousness Industry], which the alphabetizers have been incapable of outplaying to date" (ibid., 93). Before art can be reassigned any political purpose, the social consciousness as a whole would need to be changed, or as Enzensberger puts it: "The political alphabetization of Germany is an immense project. Like every other undertaking, it should of course start with the alphabetization of the alphabetizers" (ibid.). This last passage is a twist on Marx's third thesis on Feuerbach, in which Marx claims that "it is essential to educate the educator himself" (1978d [1888], 144).

Here, an enormous gap between the two journals again emerges. Interestingly, both Enzensberger and Michel end their essays with twists on Marx's *Theses on Feuerbach*. For Marx, philosophers needed to stop interpreting the world and change it,

whereas for Michel artists need to stop poeticizing the world in order to change it by offering new visions of what the world could be. For Marx, the transformation of consciousness has to start by educating the educator. For Enzensberger, this objective is reached by alphabetizing the alphabetizer, by raising consciousness about the material systems in which artists and critics function, not just asking them to produce something different in systems that continue to function as they always have.

These parallel references that point in opposite directions highlight *Kursbuch*'s aim during its first years beyond any doubt and set it apart from *Literaturmagazin*: *Kursbuch* actively envisioned political change inspired by a Marxist framework of analysis of the base, not vain attempts to reform the superstructure. Spinning the *Theses on Feuerbach* in this way furthermore opens a hopeful window towards political reform that might have lasting effect. After all, Marx's theses on Feuerbach might accept that "men are products of circumstances and upbringing, and that, therefore, changed men are products of other circumstances and changed upbringing" (ibid.). However, Marx also states that "it is men who change circumstances" (ibid.), allowing a revolutionary potential within humans themselves. The overriding question distinguishing *Kursbuch* from *Literaturmagazin* thus remains: how could such potential be triggered? And what role does art play in this process?

Each magazine had its desired impact. Both Michel and Enzensberger raised much controversy in publishing their essays: their evaluation of postwar literary culture in West Germany was extremely negative; in contrast to the left-liberal literary establishment (characterized by *Group 47*, theorized by the Frankfurt School, and

monitored by critics such as Reich-Ranicki), they viewed the student movement as a positive influence on German culture (Dirke 1997, 60). The metaphor of the *Death of Literature* that each trumpeted in its own way challenged the self-understanding of the West German literary intelligentsia as an oppositional force within society (ibid.). Nonetheless, against the common misconception, neither Michel nor Enzensberger had suggested that literature itself was dead—they just stated that it was useless for furthering any political agenda (ibid., 61).

As a result, *Kursbuch* barely paid any attention to literary debates in its consequent issues (the one notable exception might be Peter Schneider's essay "Fantasy in Late Capitalism and the Cultural Revolution" in *Kursbuch* #16, which was a follow-up to *Kursbuch* #15). Other than that, *Kursbuch*'s content concentrated on political action and thought, taking a course parallel to the student movement's radicalization. *Kursbuch* #16 (March 1969), for example, focused on the *Dialectics of Liberation Congress* held in London from July 15–30, 1967.[32] *Kursbuch* #17 (June 1969) was committed to questions around feminism and women's liberation movements. *Kursbuch* #18 (October 1969) was a special issue on Cuba and socialism, and *Kursbuch* #19 (December 1969) was a critique of anarchism. With the exception of *Kursbuch* #18, none of these issues included any fictional or non-documentary texts, which once again highlights *Kursbuch*'s documentary engagement as represented in dossiers and to creating debate through a kind of montage strategy rather than to offering utopian visions. Only *Kursbuch* #20 (March 1970) was a

[32] See the edited volume *To Free A Generation: The Dialectics of Liberation* (Cooper 1969 [1968]) for a compilation of speeches from the congress.

return to aesthetic questions. Let me now turn to a further examination of this issue and how its approach to Marxist aesthetics relates to *Literaturmagazin*.

THE AESTHETICS OF REVOLUTION, OR REVOLUTION THROUGH AESTHETICS?

To highlight the difference between the two journals in yet another way, let me briefly contextualize the cultural-political position of *Kursbuch* 20. Enzensberger and Michel had long shared a mutual skepticism towards Theodor W. Adorno, in particular to the latter's pessimistic position about political change in late capitalism (see chapter 1). Enzensberger even tried (unsuccessfully) to expose Adorno's questionable leftism by convincing him to publish in *Kursbuch* and clarify his political positions.[33] The *Kursbuch* founder furthermore accused Adorno of political cowardice and criticized the latter's support for the SPD—a critique echoed in the student movement.[34] *Kursbuch* #20 was published in 1970, the same year as Adorno's posthumous and unfinished *Aesthetic Theory*. Up until his 1969 death, Adorno administered Walter Benjamin's assets, which caused much criticism, as it was feared that Adorno's pessimistic outlook on the subversive potential of art could have impacted or silenced Benjamin's legacy (Niese 2017, 410–1). Thus, *Kursbuch* #20 arguably tried to achieve at least two objectives. First,

[33] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 22.09.1965: "den rückzug aufs kollektiv wollen wir ihm [Adorno] aber lieber nicht erlauben. soll er doch einmal unumwunden sagen, wie ers mit seinem leftism eigentlich hat. ich bezweifle freilich, ob ers tun wird."

[34] SUA: letter from Hans Magnus Enzensberger to Karl Markus Michel from 29.07.1966: "er [Adorno] hat eben angst vor der eigenen courage bekommen, obgleich die gar nicht so furchteinflößend ist. im juni redete er sich auf taktische rücksichten hinaus: da die spd doch die bundestagswahlen verloren habe, könnte man ihr nun nicht in den rücken fallen. da die spd doch die wahlen in nordrhein-w gewonnen hat, muss er sich nun schon ein neues argument einfallen lassen."

it hoped to paint a revolutionary picture of Walter Benjamin's aesthetic legacy and rescue it from the aura of the Frankfurt School. And second, Enzensberger and Michel wanted to redefine aesthetics beyond the Adorno-based Frankfurt School canon (ibid., 409).

As mentioned above, Walter Benjamin had become a central figure for the student revolts around 1968, which is reflected in *Kursbuch* #20. Benjamin's "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility," first published in 1935, was made accessible to a broad German audience for the first time in 1963 as part of the Benjamin edition edited by Adorno and his wife Gretel (Siegfried 2006, 663). In the essay, Benjamin reopened a discussion on the political potential of art that earlier Marxist critics had resolved with an appeal to "authenticity" as a critical view of real circumstances: "*But as soon as the criterion of authenticity ceases to be applied to artistic production, the whole social function of art is revolutionized. Instead of being founded on ritual, it is based on a different practice: politics*" (2008 [1935], 25). The 1960s Benjamin reception thus involved a shift away from Adorno's pessimistic cultural industry towards questions about the emancipatory potential of mass culture (a development *not* endorsed by Adorno), especially by connecting art with left politics (Siegfried 2006, 663). Against Adorno's limitations to theoretical criticism, Benjamin seemed to have provided the theoretical superstructure for the political praxis of a cultural revolution, which made him the "theoretical crown witness of art's politicization" (ibid., 663–4). There was, in brief, an opening to subvert the Frankfurt School's essentially bourgeois leftism by recourse to popular culture through Benjamin's optics, which itself historicized and criticized the art ideologies of the bourgeoisie as class- and time-bound.

Moving past Adorno had its moment historically, as well. *Kursbuch* #20 starts with an unpublished manuscript by Walter Benjamin, edited and commented by Rolf Tiedemann (1932–2018), who studied Benjamin under the guidance of Adorno and who was in charge of both Adorno's and Benjamin's assets after Adorno died in 1969. According to Tiedemann, Benjamin wrote the manuscript at some point between February 1937 and April 1938 (1970, 6). In it, Benjamin stresses the importance of considering the materialist transmission [*Überlieferung*] of bourgeois works of art in determining their value for political change. His main argument is that it would be a "vulgar-Marxist illusion" to deprive the social function of a piece of art without designating the "carrier of its transmission."[35]

Benjamin's materialist method suggests that any analysis of art should not be misled by a work's apparent definitiveness or vividness—it is a commodity reifying a particular point of view, like any other. The only "real" part of a piece of bourgeois art, he asserts, is how bourgeois society's class interest is revealed in its transmission. A materialist analysis should therefore put the purported spiritual content of a work of art and its material properties into a dialectical relationship with its channels of transmission and consumption.[36] Put into praxis, Benjamin argues that it is useless to approach art solely by assuming its immediate value for the proletarian class struggle because that art

---

[35] Original German quote: "Es ist eine vulgärmarxistische Illusion, die gesellschaftliche Funktion eines sei es geistigen, sei es materiellen Produkts unter Absehung von den Umständen und den Trägern seiner Überlieferung bestimmen zu können" (Benjamin 1970, 1).

[36] Original German quote: "Dem dergestalt erzielten Bild stünde nichts schlechter an als Endgültigkeit für sich zu beanspruchen. Seine Lebendigkeit ist eine scheinbare, und sein Wert beruht ganz gewiß nicht auf ihr. Unscheinbar, aber echt, ist aber der Konflikt, in dem in einem bestimmten Fall die gesellschaftlichen Interessen der Überlieferung mit dem Gegenstande liegen, der überliefert wird. Der Wert des erzielten Bildes beruht vielmehr darauf, den Dargestellten als Zeugen gegen die Überlieferung anzubieten" (ibid., 2).

is always mediated through various transmission channels and hence essentialized to a possibly non-proletarian consciousness. By taking the example of French poet Charles Baudelaire (1821–67), he instead suggests that one should confront bourgeois artists through art using their own class contradictions to stage the contradictions inherent in them. By doing so, Baudelaire would emerge as a "secret agent" of the "secret dissatisfaction" within the bourgeoisie itself.[37] Briefly summarized, the actual value of bourgeois art for the proletarian class struggle lies in its potential to reveal bourgeois class interest and discontent, not to offer a transformative vision, which it by definition cannot do because of its mediation.

In the manuscript's subsequent commentary, Tiedemann, by referencing Benjamin's unfinished and then still-unpublished *Arcades Project*, stresses the latter's revolutionary historical materialism and the need to radically historize works of art in assessing their potential as critique. In contrast to "the political quietism of Adorno's Institute" (Eley 2008, 39), Tiedemann's *Benjamin appropriation* highlights instead that every materialist historicization has to be an act of productive criticism aimed at transforming the present, not just a process of passive reflection (Tiedemann 1970, 7). Or, as Benjamin puts it himself: "Scientific method is distinguished by the fact that, in leading to new objects, it develops new methods. Just as form in art is distinguished by the fact that, opening up new contents, it develops new forms" (2002 [1982], 473).

---

[37] Original German quote: "Es hat wenig Wert, die Position eines Baudelaire in das Netz der vorgeschobensten Befestigungen im Befreiungskampfe der Menschheit einbeziehen zu wollen. Es scheint von vornherein sehr viel chancenreicher, seinen Machenschaften dort nachzugehen, wo er ohne Frage zu Hause ist: im gegnerischen Lager. [...] Baudelaire war ein Geheimagent. Ein Agent der geheimen Unzufriedenheit seiner Klasse mit ihrer eignen Herrschaft. Wer ihn mit dieser Klasse konfrontiert, der holt mehr heraus als wer ihn vom proletarischen Standpunkt aus als uninteressant abtut" (ibid., 3).

Tiedemann then highlights another passage from the *Arcades Project*, in which Benjamin addresses the dialectic of theoretical contemplation and actual praxis: "Being a dialectician means having the wind of history in one's sails. The sails are the concepts. It is not enough, however, to have sails at one's disposal. What is decisive is knowing the art of setting them" (2002 [1982], 473).[38] This *Benjamin appropriation* emphasizes the need for activists to harmonize theory with praxis and is thus critical of both passive theorizing (Adorno) as well as unreflective actionism (student revolutionaries). This makes Benjamin especially topical within the political situation of 1970: Marxism had once again failed to deliver the theoretical superstructure for actual political change in "1968," and the student revolutionaries had failed to work out Benjamin's dialectic of a technical-scientific productive force and a transformation in consciousness for the public consuming works of art (Hillach 1977, 86).

In the context of "1968," Tiedemann's commentary on Benjamin's manuscript demands a "radical somersault" reversing the Left's "established paths" of Marxist aesthetic criticism (Niese 2017, 412). Benjamin seems to have been the right reference point for such a call, and not only because his work needed to be split off from the Frankfurt School's optics. Benjamin has always been skeptical of the "mainstream" Marxist theories of art, which he considered as "one moment swaggering, and in the next scholastic" (2002 [1982], 465). Instead, he asserted that it is the historian's duty to "erect a slender but sturdy scaffolding—a philosophic structure—in order to draw the most vital

[38] *Kursbuch* published Benjamin's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *The Arcades Project* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

aspects of the past into his net" and render them in forms accessible to critique (ibid., 459).

The Benjamin manuscript published in *Kursbuch* #20 demands a rethinking of what I have called Marxist "realism 2.0." By doing so, it actually stands in a sharp contrast to (and a pre-emptive criticism of) *Kursbuch* #15 and the idea that there is no political value in art. In fact, Benjamin's reasoning has a lot more in common with *Literaturmagazin* #2 (1974), in which its editor Buch examines the postwar reception of German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832). As outlined in chapter 2, Buch argues that "it is not the task of materialist analysis to label Goethe either as a reactionary or a revolutionary, but rather to dialectically render visible the compromises he made in relation to his historical accomplishments."[39] Benjamin's essay, too, is about making bourgeois writers such as Baudelaire applicable for Marxist literary criticism, instead of condemning them because of their bourgeois class affiliation (Niese 2017, 411–2).

Presumably, in response to the disappointments of the absent cultural revolution of "1968," *Kursbuch* #20 had continued to allow room for opinions that are in contrast to its editors' previous assumptions—Benjamin's work could be seen as a nuanced advance over that blanket rejection. My assumption of *Kursbuch* #20's attempts to foster debate instead of becoming a single-program journal is bolstered by an additional fact: aside from Benjamin's manuscript, the issue also features an essay by Hans Christoph Buch

[39] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief an Autoren und Mitarbeiter des LITERATURMAGAZINS (2)* from Hans Christoph Buch from December 1973: "Aufgabe der materialistischen Analyse ist es jedoch nicht, Goethe zum Reaktionär oder Revolutionär zu stempeln, sondern vielmehr, dialektisch seine Kompromisse im Verhältnis zu seiner historischen Leistung sichtbar zu machen."

himself, the soon to be *Literaturmagazin* editor. As documented throughout this dissertation, Buch had from the first a fierce critique of *Kursbuch*, which he considered "stuck somewhere between Wittenau and North Korea" on "its long march through the institutions."[40] He furthermore early on dismissed Enzensberger's aesthetic viewpoints as the result of "petit-bourgeois resignation" (1969, 45) and Adorno's and Horkheimer's *Culture Industry* as a pessimistic and narrow "enlightenment with a raised index finger" (see chapter 1's footnote 38). French Structuralism, for Buch, was nothing but an ahistorical and undialectical "battle cry of a technocratic intelligentsia" and thus an instrument of bourgeois ideology (1972b [1969], 69). And his arguably main scorn was towards the self-proclaimed student revolutionaries, whose rebellion he considered a counterrevolutionary caricature of an upheaval (1968 [1967], 133) and whose aesthetic theories he regarded as being no different than those of their dogmatic East German and Soviet counterparts (1972e, 87).

What distinguished Buch from most of his contemporaries was, in essence, that his aesthetic theorizing has remained committed to art as able to participate in dialectical Marxism rather than the international mass movement of political critique that it had become around 1968, an evolution which rejected a half-century of revolutionary art in all media. The former allowed him to criticize his fellow Marxists and their frequent assumptions from a meta-perspective, as becomes clear in his *Kursbuch* essay, entitled "Von der möglichen Funktion der Literatur: Eine Art Metakritik" [On the Possible

[40] A:Rowohlt-Verlag, *Rundbrief zum Projekt "Literaturmagazin"* from Hans Christoph Buch and Jürgen Manthey from February 1973: "[…] das 'Kursbuch' ist auf seinem langen Marsch durch die Institutionen irgendwo zwischen Wittenau und Nordkorea steckengeblieben."

Function of Literature: A Kind of Metacriticism]. As already outlined in chapter 1, Buch's article again criticizes *Kursbuch*'s (and simultaneously the New Left's) Eurocentric and inflexible approach to Marxism (Niese 2017, 523).

Buch starts the essay with a critique of aesthetic criticism. When aesthetic criticism as a discipline claims to stand beyond the work of art autocratically, Buch asserts, it renders art as superfluous (1970, 42). Both bourgeois and progressive artists and their critics, Buch suggests, fail to combine literary theory and praxis dialectically. Aesthetic dogmatism would, put differently, create a closed system in itself, to which an author then is expected to match their work of art. Such a theory-driven and dogmatic approach to art would be as flawed as its oppositional "theory-hostile pragmatism" detached from all reasoning.[41] Buch criticizes in particular the New Left's *Brecht appropriation*, which I have documented above using the example of *Kursbuch* #7. He argues that, instead of using Brecht's proposed balanced relationship between theory and praxis, aesthetic dogmatism would overgeneralize Brecht's work for partisan intentions. By doing so, aesthetic theory would become a rigid system in itself while forfeiting its credibility towards literary praxis (ibid.). Buch then applies his criticism to the highly debated *Kursbuch* #15 issue, whose key texts and argument I have examined above.

As a very overt challenge to the journal he is actually publishing in, Buch assesses the *Kursbuch* issue from November 1968 as representing the pragmatic failure of

[41] Original German quote: "Dem Autor wird zugemutet, zum fertigen System lediglich die passende Illustration zu liefern: Literatur als Probe aufs Exempel. Solcher Schematismus ist genauso falsch wie sein Gegenteil: der theoriefeindliche Pragmatismus mancher Schriftsteller, die sich auf einen mysteriösen Instinkt berufen, vor dem die Vernunft allemal stillzustehen hat. Theorie und Praxis fallen undialektisch auseinander – leider nicht nur innerhalb der bürgerlichen Ästhetik, von der man es ohnehin nicht besser erwartet, sondern auch im Lager des Materialismus" (Buch 1970, 42).

Enzensberger's theoretical ambitions. Quite cynically, the eventual *Literaturmagazin* founder discards *Kursbuch* #15 as the "ultimate surrender to the almighty instruments of the Consciousness Industry" (ibid., 44). This is a direct attack on Enzensberger, who not only coined the term "Consciousness Industry," but furthermore argued that it is the intellectual's task to seize control of it to overcome capital's manipulative apparatuses (see chapter 1). According to Buch, Enzensberger's suggestion of putting all emancipatory hope in the hands of engaged intellectuals and their guided criticism ultimately set the path for an undialectical assertion of the *Death of Literature*, which would confirm what Buch describes as *Kursbuch*'s "petit-bourgeois anarchism" rather than dialectical Marxism (ibid.).

With regard to Enzensberger's claim that literary works "cannot be assigned an essential social function under present conditions" (1974a [1968], 92), Buch responds by agreeing that "no serious Marxist would question the base's primacy over the superstructure" and that one undoubtedly has to refrain from having "exaggerated expectations" towards art's role in the class struggle. However, falling for the opposite assertion by liquidating all art, as advocated in *Kursbuch* #15, would be both an aesthetic and political fallacy because the transmission of art is part of the base.[42] Buch refers to Karl Korsch's notion of *economistic tendency* to highlight this claim further:

[42] Original German quote: "Das Primat der Basis über den Überbau wird kein ernsthafter Marxist in Abrede stellen; er wird sich deshalb hüten, übertriebene Erwartungen zu hegen, was die Rolle der Kunst im Klassenkampf betrifft; genausowenig aber wird er ins entgegengesetzte Extrem verfallen und die Literatur einfach liquidieren wollen. Das hieße einen Fehler begehen, der letztlich nicht nur ästhetisch, sondern politisch motiviert ist" (ibid., 45).

> According to this first misconception, which we will henceforth call the 'economistic' tendency, it is only the economic struggle of the workers and the forms of social struggle springing directly from it which are recognised as directly proletarian and revolutionary action, whereas all other forms of struggle […] are regarded as an undesirable deviation from the real revolutionary aims. (2016 [1938], 158)[43]

In brief, instead of reducing all revolutionary efforts to the status of symptoms of immediate economic and social struggles, Buch values the social function of art and culture because of its "ideological preparation for the revolution" (1970, 47). Calling art socially purposeless, as was done by the *Kursbuch* editors in the magazine's November 1968 issue, would therefore be counterrevolutionary.

Buch then turns his attention to Benjamin—both Enzensberger's *Kursbuch* #15 essay and Buch's response to it refer to Benjamin's "The Author as Producer" (1937). Remember that Enzensberger appropriated Benjamin to highlight how "the bourgeois apparatus of production and publication can assimilate astonishing qualities of revolutionary themes" and argues that "a considerable proportion of so-called left-wing literature possessed no other social function than to wring from the political situation a continuous stream of novel effects for the entertainment of the public" (Benjamin 1982 [1937], 262).

Buch, by referencing the same Benjamin essay, asserts that precisely *because* the bourgeois apparatus can assimilate revolutionary themes, every writer should turn from

[43] *Kursbuch* published Korsch's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *Karl Marx* (Leiden: Brill, 2016).

being "a supplier of the productive apparatus" into "an engineer who sees it as his task to adapt this apparatus to the purposes of the proletarian revolution" (ibid., 268). Where Enzensberger reads Benjamin's essay as evidence for art's impotence within an all-absorbing capitalist market, Buch suggests that works of art can transform themselves from being "apparatuses of capitalist heteronomy" to "instruments of self-determination" in order to anticipate and produce socialist utopian inspiration.[44] The implications of Buch's argument for assessing the role of intellectuals will be discussed below, in a chapter entitled "Engaged Intellectuals in a Bourgeois Public Sphere."

Buch ends his first and only *Kursbuch* contribution by stressing one of his major aesthetic arguments: the revolutionary potential of utopian literature, which he understands as the ability of a work of art to have an impact beyond the historical inducement of its emergence ["die Fähigkeit eines Kunstwerks, über den historischen Anlaß seiner Entstehung hinaus zu wirken "] (1970, 47). As mentioned in chapter 1, Buch's critique includes Adorno's aesthetic pessimism, although he does not mention Adorno by name. Remember that in reference to Kafka, Adorno argued that "over whom Kafka's wheels have passed has lost forever both any peace with the world and any chance of consoling himself with the judgment that the way of the world is bad" (1982b [1962], 315). Against that pessimism, Buch asserts that "the consciousness-raising depiction of alienation" in Kafka's work is, in fact, "the first step of its [alienation's]

[44] Original German quote: "Zur Beurteilung dieser Funktion hat Walter Benjamin ein brauchbares Modell geliefert; er bemißt das kritische Potential der Literatur an ihrer Fähigkeit, Produktionsapparate nicht nur zu beliefern, sondern – im Sinne des Sozialismus – zu verändern. Verlage, Theater, Zeitungen und Zeitschriften müssen von Apparaten kapitalistischer Fremdbestimmung zu Instrumenten der Selbstbestimmung ihrer Produzenten werden und so, unter den herrschenden Bedingungen, ein Stück sozialistischer Utopie vorwegnehmen" (Buch 1970, 47–8).

sublation" (1970, 49). Instead of merely describing the world's misery, Buch suggests that art can point out the sources of suffering in order to contribute to its abolition, in a moment of consciousness-raising. In response to the *Death of Literature* thesis, then, he asserts that no one should disregard writers such as Kafka or Beckett just because they do not write specifically for a proletarian class interest (1970, 50–1).

Taken together, Buch advocates art's productive role within the anti-capitalist struggle. Reducing art's potential to only expressing misery (Adorno) or even denying its social function at all (Enzensberger) represents for the *Literaturmagazin* founder the dialectical failure to harmonize literary theory and praxis. By referencing Benjamin in this way, Buch insists that art production within a capitalist market has the potential to alter that market and influence capitalist market mechanisms because they are part of the base of economic relations and products that produce consciousness (as Benjamin made the case for panoramas, film, and wrought-iron arcades, as well). Yet, as outlined above, Enzensberger and Michel denied that argument in *Kursbuch* #15 due to the elitist status of literature and its social detachment from the broad mass of the population.

In the last essay of *Kursbuch* #20, they persisted in this view, bypassing Buch and perhaps explaining why he never published there again. Yet Enzensberger's article "Constituents of a Theory of the Media" also follows Benjamin (and the realist debates of the 1920s about film) when he suggests that the new (i.e. electronic) media can overcome the elitist status of literature and therefore be useful for socialist causes.[45] Buch would see it as paradoxical (at best) that Enzensberger continues to consider art in its

[45] *Kursbuch* published Enzensberger's essay in German. The English translation is taken from *The Consciousness Industry: On Literature, Politics and the Media* (New York: Seabury, 1974).

contemporaneous form as socially purposeless but argues that it can be a productive force if it develops itself through the new possibilities provided by the new media. Nonetheless, this distinction is also made by Benjamin, when, in "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility," he distinguishes cinema art from art in museums as lying the bourgeoisie's preference for work with an "aura" of one-time genius creation rather than as an intervention into the symbolic order.

Enzensberger's media essay thus actually moves beyond Buch in some ways, especially when he considers traditional written literature and its production as a "repressive craft" due to it being "a highly formalized technique" that demands a "high degree of social specialization" (1974b [1970], 122–3). The written book, for example, would structurally be "a medium that operates as a monologue, isolating producer and reader," measured by the "extremely cumbersome and elitist" control circuit of literary criticism (ibid.). But the *Kursbuch* founder argues that the new media, by contrast, could potentially overcome such repressive limitations:

> None of the characteristics that distinguish written and printed literature apply to the electronic media. Microphone and camera abolish the class character of the mode of production (not of the production itself). The normative rules become unimportant. Oral interviews, arguments, demonstrations, neither demand nor allow orthography or "good writing." The television screen exposes the [a]esthetic smoothing-out of contradictions as camouflage. (ibid., 124)

In contrast to traditional media outlets such as literature, Enzensberger highlights what he considers the democratic potential of electronic media:

> The new media are egalitarian in structure. Anyone can take part in them by a simple switching process. The programs themselves are not material things and can be reproduced at will. In this sense the electronic media are entirely different from the older media like the book or the easel painting, the exclusive class character of which is obvious. (ibid., 105)

The revolutionary possibilities of new media, Enzensberger suggests, have the potential to revolutionize art itself and, by doing so, lifting it out of its bourgeois and reactionary class character: "What used to be called art, has now, in the strict Hegelian sense, been dialectically surpassed by and in the media" (ibid., 121)—an expansion of Benjamin's point on film. For Enzensberger, it is actually just traditional art and its artists who are still politically purposeless as long as they operate in categories such as autonomy, privilege, skill, experience, and knowledge. What is needed is a radical change of perspective about the nature of "art": "Instead of looking at the productions of the new media from the point of view of the older modes of production we must, on the contrary, analyze the products of the traditional artistic media from the standpoint of modern conditions of production" (ibid.). In other words, as Benjamin noted, there are good reasons to decry bourgeois control of art, but perhaps at the same time to acknowledge new forms of art production that the bourgeoisie might not recognize as such.

Enzensberger's embeddedness to Benjamin's "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility" is clearly at the core of the *Kursbuch* essay. He quotes the following passage from Benjamin, emphasizing the need to develop art forms as media outlets develop:

> It has always been one of the primary tasks of art to create a demand whose hour of full satisfaction has not yet come. The history of every art form has critical periods in which the particular form strains after effects which can be easily achieved only with a changed technical standard—that is to say, in a new art form. (2008 [1935], 38)[46]

At first glance, Enzensberger seems to echo the arguments Buch made all along: contemporaneous New Leftists fail to understand vital Marxist insights. He considers returning to previous thinkers such as Benjamin necessary for revolutionary progress. But while such a return can be interpreted as an acknowledgment of the theoretical shortcomings of the Marxist aesthetic theoreticians around "1968," Enzensberger ultimately discredits *all* aesthetic theories, traditional as well as contemporaneous:

> The revolution in the conditions of production in the superstructure has made the traditional [a]esthetic theory unusable, completely unhinging its fundamental categories and destroying its "standards." The theory of knowledge on which it was based is outmoded. In the electronic media, a radically altered relationship between subject and object emerges with which the old critical concepts cannot deal. (1974b [1970], 119)

One the one side, Enzensberger considers Benjamin as "the only Marxist theoretician who recognized the liberating potential of the new media" and whose "approach has not been matched by any theory since then, much less further developed" (ibid., 120). One

---

[46] *Kursbuch* published Benjamin's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility, and Other Writings on Media* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008).

the other side, however, Enzensberger continues that there is no conceptual scheme yet capable of "releasing the emancipatory potential[,] which is inherent in the new productive forces" (ibid., 96). That is, he recognizes that the pervasive association of art with *Bildung* and genius runs too deeply through Western aesthetics to allow for any continuation into new art forms—he is not in the situation of the Russian Formalists who could start re-defining literary art on the basis of communicative formalisms and linguistics (see chapter 3).

Arguably, Enzensberger would see a degree of naïveté in Buch's assumption that older forms can be modified to new circumstances while holding older forms of discourse about aesthetics in place. Thus, although his dossiers act as montage, he does *not* hark back to those pre-World War II discussions, except in the forms modernized by Benjamin that also circumvent inherited discourses about aesthetics in favor of arguing the relations between material base and consciousness at historically precisely delimited sites like Paris. Thus, the only theoretical framework Enzensberger seems to remain faithful to is his own concept of the Consciousness Industry (see chapter 1). But instead of suggesting that it is solely the intellectual's duty to seize capitalism's manipulation apparatus, Enzensberger now focusses on the media's emancipatory potential for such a task—virtually, for crowd-sourcing the task of representation-making into new venues and classes of production. In fact, he even seems to take a stance *against* intellectual guidance, as I will show below in the subsequent chapter "Engaged Intellectuals in a Bourgeois Public Sphere."

However, the duty that Enzensberger attributed to intellectuals in the 1960s and media producers in the 1970s remains the same, and it is their pragmatic expertise that he wishes to mobilize, not their aesthetics: he wants them less to guide and more to rally the masses to identify contemporary issues, which he considers, now back in classic Marxist fashion, as the agent of revolutionary change: "When I say *mobilize* I mean *mobilize*. […] Anyone who thinks of the masses only as the object of politics cannot mobilize them" (ibid., 97). The New Left, Enzensberger argues, has failed to summon the masses because it was unable to utilize the revolutionary potential of the media and instead focused on repressive outlets such as literature to "lead" the public to an essentially normative conceptualization of the free subject *qua* bourgeois subject. The reason for this, according to Enzensberger, lies firmly anchored in its bourgeois class background and its adherence to bourgeois institutions for reproducing one version of an ideal subject: "In the New Left's opposition to the media, old bourgeois fears such as the fear of 'the masses' seem to be reappearing along with equally old bourgeois longings for pre-industrial times dressed up in progressive clothing" (ibid., 102).

The Marxists' failure to understand how to repurpose new media for new social and especially socialist causes, Enzensberger asserts, would have produced a vacuum of momentum "in Western industrialized countries into which a stream of non-Marxist hypotheses and practices has consequently flowed" (ibid., 117). His scorn is directed particularly towards the avant-garde art scene, for example, the Swiss Dada nightclub *Cabaret Voltaire*, Andy Warhol's (1928–87) art studios, the music of *The Beatles*, as well as Europe's comic-strip artists, all of whom have failed to catalyze change through

forming larger collectives, even as they codified certain sanitized versions of social and political rebellion for smaller groups. All these now essentially *apolitical* phenomena could have "made much more radical progress in dealing with the media than any grouping of the Left" (ibid.). Furthermore, media theorists such as Marshall McLuhan (1911–80), particularly in his famous claim that "the medium is the message," would only signal that "the bourgeoisie does indeed have all possible means at its disposal to communicate something to us, but that it has nothing more to say. […] It wants the media *as such* and *to no purpose*" (ibid., 119).

According to the *Kursbuch* editor, the New Left's essentially bourgeois cultural archaism and its fear "of being swallowed up by the system is a sign of weakness" that "presupposes that capitalism could overcome any contradiction" (ibid., 103–4). Let us remember that Enzensberger's strategy for seizing the Consciousness Industry suggests that it "might be a better idea to enter the dangerous game" (1974d [1962], 15). In other words, any operation outside of the capitalist system would be reactionary with respect to socialist causes: "Capitalism alone benefits from the Left's antagonism to the media, as it does from the depoliticization of the counterculture" (1974b [1970], 104). To combat capitalism thus requires working with the media and within the system.

Enzensberger's remarks on human needs and capitalist exploitation of them exemplify his call for engaging with capitalist media rather than opposing them from the outside. For example, he rejects the "all too widely disseminated thesis […] that present-day capitalism lives by the exploitation of unreal needs" (ibid., 110), by creating false images of what individuals need for their sustenance and happiness—a claim famously

made, among others, by Marcuse.[47] Instead, the *Kursbuch* editor suggests that mass consumption "is based not on the dictates of false needs, but on the falsification and exploitation of quite real and legitimate ones" (ibid.). A Marxist media analysis therefore should not discredit capitalist media but analyze and appropriate its underlying messages: "Consumption as spectacle is—in parody form—the anticipation of a utopian situation" (ibid., 112). Put brief, while the Consciousness Industry cannot satisfy the needs it presents, Marxism should seize the manipulation apparatus and "show that they [needs] can be met only through a cultural revolution" and not simply through consumption of commodities (ibid., 113). For Enzensberger, any emancipatory use of the new media has to include the following seven characteristics:

(1) it needs to be decentralized rather than centrally controlled
(2) each receiver has to be a potential transmitter
(3) masses rather than isolated individuals need to be mobilized
(4) active feedback and interaction need to replace passive consumption
(5) a political learning process has to be at the center
(6) content needs to be produced collectively rather than by specialists
(7) social control has to take place by self-organization rather than by property owners or bureaucracy (ibid.).

Taken together, these characteristics illustrate how Enzensberger continues to reject the possibility of art's productive role within the anti-capitalist struggle as advocated by Buch in the same 1970 *Kursbuch* issue and as art as then defined. He even radicalizes his thought process further by not only discrediting modernist literature but by also devaluing all

[47] In *One-Dimensional Man*, for example, Marcuse argues that capitalist consumption alters human needs rather than revealing them: "The people recognize themselves in their commodities; they find their soul in their automobile, hi-fi set, split-level home, kitchen equipment. The very mechanism which ties the individual to his society has changed, and social control is anchored in the new needs which it has produced" (2007 [1964], 11).

written literature as reactionary and socially purposeless, including even the documentary genres his journal advocated in previous issues. The revolutionary potential of new electronic media, for Enzensberger, lies in its democratic characteristics, not in traditional art forms. He therefore remains true to his push against art, even though he utilizes some earlier Marxist-inspired aesthetic theories, especially the work of Walter Benjamin (as did Buch), as ground for his rejection. New art forms, Enzensberger reasons, have to be developed in line with the new media formats in order to achieve emancipatory potential.

Enzensberger's essay echoes revolutionary calls not only from pre-World War II Marxist debates, but also contemporaneous ones issued by others such as US activist Jerry Rubin (1938–94), who also in 1970 famously stated: "You can't be a revolutionary today without a television set—it's as important as a gun! Every guerilla must know how to use the terrain of the culture that he is trying to destroy" (Rubin 1970, 108). Albeit in a more radicalized fashion than his first *Kursbuch* issues, Enzensberger here extends his political agenda—marked by action-driven aspirations for social change, dogmatic rejections of everything he considers counterrevolutionary, and always up to date with current developments and events.

How Enzensberger incorporates and refutes Buch's work both continues and updates earlier Marxist debates. What is most critical, however, is their joint recovery of Benjamin as both outside of and leading beyond both *Group 47* and the Frankfurt School.

SOME CONCLUSIONS: THE NEW MARXIST AESTHETICS?

This chapter concludes on a note that seems to reoccur throughout the project at hand: different Marxist approaches around "1968" have quite similar goals (anti-capitalist transformation of society through a change of consciousness) but entirely different methods on how to achieve such objectives. My comparison of *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* typifies that difference, starting from the insight that both magazines conceptualized their Marxist magazines differently. *Kursbuch* emphasized "a new political-literary dimension" by widely including documentary genres in its *dossier* sections (Niese 2017, 133–4). This fondness for documentary texts represents what I have called Marxist "realism 2.0" and even goes so far to be antagonistic to poetic and fictional genres, as I have shown in the example of *Kursbuch*'s editorial interventions.

After *Kursbuch*'s first five years of publication, Enzensberger suggested in 1970 that every written genre is counterproductive for socialist causes and that Marxists should instead focus on entirely new media outlets. The journal's aesthetic radicalization therefore goes hand in hand with the political radicalization around "1968." The emphasis on the contemporary furthermore reflects itself in *Kursbuch*'s content, which is mostly based on contemporaneous debates and developments.

Aesthetically, *Kursbuch* symbolizes a dogmatism in favor of political engagement that is grounded in earlier aesthetic disputes, namely the *Realism-Modernism Debate*. This inheritance becomes apparent when considering that, even though *Kursbuch* focused on contemporaneous thinkers, famous names from earlier aesthetic debates frequently find their way into the journal, namely Benjamin, Brecht, and Lukács—all of which, as I have

shown, are being appropriated for *Kursbuch*'s aesthetic intentions in very partisan ways. In the case of *Kursbuch*, such intentions are characterized by the question of how art can or cannot serve direct political change and how it is useful for the immediate agents of such change.

Throughout its first five years of publication, *Kursbuch* rejects and discredits art forms that do not match its aesthetic guidelines. In the heat of the events of "1968," the journal follows an action-driven agenda, which had a direct impact on its perception of the role of literature and how it needed to change for the current generation: it assumed that the FRG's literary establishment and its critics consist of former Nazis, they are an elitist bourgeois circle detached from social reality, and they participate in a reactionary craft which only benefits capitalist exploitation and which thus is incapable of mobilizing revolutionary masses. Modernist art is overtly counterrevolutionary, and the political literature of the day is too elitist to be viable for change. Around 1968 in *Kursbuch*, literature—politically engaged or not—thus has no value for revolutionary ambitions in a Marxist sense.

Literaturmagazin, exemplified above by the editorial and essayistic work of its founder Buch, stands in sharp contrast to Enzensberger's *Kursbuch*. It avoids a partisan stance in the *Realism-Modernism Debate* by emphasizing that dialectical thinking is not about picking a side but rather about investigating inherent contradictions in opposing perspectives. Buch stresses that he has no intention to "resolve" aesthetic debates by appropriating either Lukács or Brecht, but simply finds value in their opposing viewpoints. Abolishing literature or romanticizing it would not benefit socialist causes.

Literaturmagazin wants literature and literary criticism to be engaged with itself rather than just being politically engaged—Buch believes in the materiality of literary form and in innovations that can transform consciousness.

As seen in the planning of *Literaturmagazin* #2, Buch can regard bourgeois art as in some ways useful for a Marxist agenda as revolutionary art—at least as a template to be transformed for contemporaneous uses. Utopian fiction is perceived as equally crucial for a transformation of consciousness as theoretical deliberation (in fact, they condition each other dialectically). In *Literaturmagazin*, transforming consciousness has to be a result of dialectical Marxism, and any normative claims concerning aesthetics must be considered counterrevolutionary. In contrast to Enzensberger, art is for Buch not socially purposeless, but it is crucial for any social change.

In sum, *Literaturmagazin* aims to alter its readers' consciousness by overcoming normative claims about how political engagement must proceed in literature by highlighting the roles of dialectical criticism and utopian art. *Kursbuch*, by contrast, wants to achieve the same goal by seizing the Consciousness Industry through direct and explicit political action, while avoiding the reproductive effects of inherited norms, particularly aesthetic ones. After contrasting *how* these two magazines sought to achieve social change methodologically, I will now turn my attention to the question of *who* should be in charge of leading such projects. Contrasting perspectives on the role of intellectuals within capitalist struggles not only reveal once again tensions between the two magazines under investigation, they furthermore illustrate conflicting viewpoints within the journals, emphasizing the highly debated nature of the role of intellectuals in a bourgeois public

sphere. By drawing on the theoretical work of Oskar Negt (1934–) and Alexander Kluge (1932–), I will begin the following chapter by briefly contrasting characteristics and shortcomings of a bourgeois public sphere with those of a proletarian public sphere to situate discussions of the role of intellectuals within those domains.

Chapter 5: Remaking a Public Critique, Part II: Engaged Intellectuals in a Bourgeois Public Sphere

Not surprisingly, debates surrounding the role of literary magazines in public debate also implied a reconsideration of how intellectuals should create critical class consciousness or even contribute to a social transformation process find their way into *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*, as well. As stated in chapter 1, *Kursbuch* founder Enzensberger regularly changed his positions towards the intellectual's role in society throughout his career (Ewen 2013, 250). But during the 1960s, if one looks into his concept of the Consciousness Industry, he seems to act as an interventionist and engaging intellectual (ibid., 261). During *Kursbuch*'s early stages, Enzensberger's understanding of an intellectual therefore seems to resonate with Ralf Dahrendorf's (1929–2009) notion of a "public intellectual," whose job it is to not only participate in prevailing public discourses but also to determine and shape them (ibid., 258). Yet this definition was by no means the only one available in the Marxist tradition. As we shall see in a moment, definitions of the public sphere and public intellectual were closely tied into our two editors' visions of

literary magazines in the public sphere—as the content provider to the newly reshaped literary magazines.

As outlined in chapter 1 as well, *Literaturmagazin* founder Buch emphasized the need to consider both proletarian and bourgeois ideologies as necessary guidance for developing anti-capitalist strategies, and he demanded full solidarity from the intelligentsia with oppressed classes (1972a, 20–1). Similar to Marcuse, Buch stresses the importance of intellectuals to provide mental space for utopian thinking. Intellectual labor, as outlined in chapter 4, serves for Buch as the "ideological preparation for the revolution" (1970, 47). Unlike Enzensberger, for whom intellectual work seems to have the purpose of guiding the working classes (teach them *what* to think), however, Buch instead understands the intelligentsia's function as enabling critical consciousness (show them *how* to think).

In order to assess the potential for intellectuals to shape the public—i.e. the act of "bringing into the open, an expressing and making public" (Jameson 2008, 218)—, then, it is essential to clarify first what is meant by "the public." After a brief start with an overview of historical forms of Marxist arguments about the historical roles of the proletariat and the intellectuals, the following section of this chapter examines two contrasting approaches on the *public sphere* that are directly linked to West Germany's Marxist debates around 1968: Jürgen Habermas's *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (1962) and, ten years later, *Public Sphere and Experience: Toward an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere* (1972) by Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge. It is worth pointing out that all three of them were affiliates and/or students of Adorno at the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research. A brief comparison of

their contrasting theoretical work on the public sphere nonetheless provides a fertile entry point into contemporaneous discussions on the topic in West Germany during the *long '68*.

Marx famously said that "the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves" (2010 [1867], 441). This remark queries the position of non-proletariats within the workers' class struggle. Marxists since then have produced a variety of different opinions regarding the intelligentsia's role in combating capitalism. Eugene V. Debs (1855–1926), political leader and presidential candidate for the former Socialist Party of America, for example, asserts in 1912 that it is the workers who liberate themselves from capitalist exploitation but that this liberation has to be guided by intellectual efforts in form of education and organization:

> The workers can be emancipated only by their own collective will, the power inherent in themselves as a class, and this collective will and conquering power can only be the result of education, enlightenment[,] and self-imposed discipline […] The sound education of the workers and their thorough organization, both economic and political, on the basis of the class struggle, must precede their emancipation. (1980 [1912], 193–4)

Lenin, arguably somewhat in contrast to Debs, sharply distinguishes between "the necessary advice of an educated man" and "the necessary control by the 'common' worker" (1977a [1929], 412). The Russian revolutionary cautions against reliance on the intelligentsia within the class struggle, even though he acknowledges that without "a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement" (1977b [1902], 369). However, in "How to Organise Competition?," written in 1917 but first published

posthumously in 1929, Lenin's romanticizing fondness for proletarians over intellectuals becomes evident in his attack on the latter:

> This slovenliness, this carelessness, untidiness, unpunctuality, nervous haste, the inclination to substitute discussion for action, talk for work, the inclination to undertake everything under the sun without finishing anything, are characteristics of the "educated"; and this is […] due to all their habits of life, the conditions of their work, to fatigue, to the abnormal separation of mental from manual labour, and so on, and so forth. (1977a [1929], 412)

In his *Prison Notebooks*, written between 1929 and 1935, Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937) takes a more leveling perspective on the relationship between intellectuals and workers: "All men are intellectuals, […] but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals" (1989, 115). Gramsci is thus advocating a dialectical relationship between social stratifications—in his example, workers and intellectuals. The Italian Marxist's point is that the socially constructed opposition between social and political groups needs to be transcended by allowing a mutual learning process. Moral patronizing and categorical refusal consequently would not benefit either side.

Benjamin, shortly after Gramsci's death, argues that the "proletarianization of an intellectual hardly ever makes a proletarian" (1982 [1937], 268). In other words, Benjamin states that the mobility between social classes is doubtful at best, as is escape from birth-related class positions. However, this inevitable class affiliation does not exclude class mediation and solidarity, as Benjamin continues by using the example of a writer: "the more exactly he is thus informed on his position in the process of production, the less it

will occur to him to lay claim 'spiritual qualities'. […] For the revolutionary struggle is not between capitalism and spirit but between capitalism and the proletariat" (ibid., 269).

With the spread of late capitalism in the wake of World War II, optimism about both proletarian revolution and intellectual influence on it seem to have faded. Adorno, faithful to his overall pessimism, stresses the intellectuals' class position, arguing that they are "at once the last enemies of the bourgeois and the last bourgeois" (2005 [1951], 46). The intelligentsia's privileged position in society, he continues, inherits "the risk of believing himself better than others and misusing his critique of society as an ideology for his private interest" (ibid., 43–4). For Adorno, there is only one role for intellectuals in society, that one of silent passivity:

> The only responsible course is to deny oneself the ideological misuse of one's own existence, and for the rest to conduct oneself in private as modestly, unobtrusively and unpretentiously as is required, no longer by good upbringing, but by the shame of still having air to breathe, in hell. (Ibid., 46–7)

Marcuse takes a slightly more optimistic stance than his former Frankfurt colleague. While acknowledging late capitalism's aporias, he reflects on his own position as follows:

> The author is fully aware that, at present, no power, no authority, no government exists which would translate liberating tolerance into practice, but he believes that it is the task and duty of the intellectual to recall and preserve historical possibilities which seem to have become utopian possibilities—that it is his task to break the concreteness of oppression in order to open the mental space in which this society can be recognized as what it is and does. (1970b [1965], 81–2)

The brief concatenation of Marxist thinkers above highlights at least two commonalities: first, intellectuals and workers are part of different social classes (even though, for Gramsci, that does not reflect a stratification of intellectualism). Second, if there is a revolutionary subject at all, it is the proletariat and not the intelligentsia. But, not surprisingly similar to the question of art's role in the anti-capitalist class struggle, the opinions differ when it comes to assessing the intelligentsia's contribution to that class brawl: Debs considers intellectual labor such as education crucial for proletarian organization; Lenin asserts a class superiority of workers over intellectuals; Gramsci advocates an egalitarian learning process between the two; Benjamin highlights the need for class solidarity with the working classes on the part of intellectuals; Marcuse stresses their duty to create utopian alternatives; and Adorno, arguably closing the circle back to Lenin, fears an ideological misappropriation through the intelligentsia's class privilege.

BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIAN PUBLIC SPHERE: BEYOND THE FRANKFURT SCHOOL

Negt and Kluge's work is a response to Jürgen Habermas's *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1962), in which the latter defines "public" as something that is "open to all" and in which "public opinion" is valued as an essential critical part of society's capacity to judge or evaluate their contexts (1991 [1962], 1–2). In a nutshell, Habermas suggests that starting the eighteenth century, the *bourgeois public sphere* arises through finance and trade capitalism, which separates private ("not holding public office or official position") and public ("the state") spheres (ibid., 11–4). As I will

show below in selected examples, Habermas's theory's shortcomings are evident and well-researched.

One obvious shortcoming had to do with the role of identity, especially gender, in the public spheres, which Habermas ignored. As critics have pointed out, Habermas provides an extremely sophisticated account of the relations between public institutions (the state or public system from the official capitalist economy) and private ones (the family or private lifeworld), and how each of these public-private separations is coordinated with others (Fraser 1985, 112). However, his categorical opposition between the institutions of the public systems and the private lifeworld is built on a gender-blindness that "fails to understand precisely how the capitalist workplace is linked to the modern, restricted, male-headed, nuclear family" (ibid., 117). Taking this feminist criticism as an example of a range of similar critiques that address socialization, Habermas's theoretical shortcomings emerge as all too often grounded in assuming a bourgeois public sphere that requires self-conscious individuals who reciprocally recognize each other within an ideal public setting from which nobody is excluded, and in which all participants are granted an equal opportunity to make contributions. His world of communications is thus highly idealized.

Habermas does recognize the contradictory ways in which his liberal model of the public sphere has manifested itself in history, but the limitations of his approach prevent him from arriving at a conceptual differentiation between the "ideal" and the "real" history of the bourgeois public sphere (Knödler-Bunte 1975, 53–4). Nonetheless, he rejects considerations of these limitations, arguing that they are neither internal nor structural but

rather the result of the historical blocking of the bourgeois revolutionary process that has remained incomplete and unrealized (Jameson 2008, 199). His core argument remains that the values of the bourgeois revolutionary period remain universal so that it would be improper to analyze them in terms of the functional ideology of a specific social class (ibid., 198–9).

Negt and Kluge do not share Habermas's notion of such a normative and thus essentially exclusionary installation of a single liberal-bourgeois public sphere (Langston 2020, 488). Especially Negt has a history of intellectual disagreements with Habermas—while being Habermas's assistant in Frankfurt, Negt co-edited in 1968 an attack on Habermas's rebuke of the West German student movement (ibid.). According to Negt and Kluge, "the tendential monopoly of the public sphere in modern times is very intimately related to the class function of the bourgeois concept of the public and to the nature of the institutions that emerged from it" (Jameson 2008, 199). Their explicit opposition to Habermas has at least three levels: (1) Negt and Kluge do not restrict themselves to the analysis of the bourgeois public sphere; (2) their political interest is directed toward the interconnections of the bourgeois-capitalist and proletarian public spheres; and (3), they believe that new structural characteristics of the public sphere thus become visible permitting both a historical and a systematic investigation of non-bourgeois, pre-capitalist, proletarian, subcultural, and even fascist public spheres (Knödler-Bunte 1975, 53).

Negt and Kluge also argue that Habermas's theory excludes substantial life interests—for example, the impact of the industrial apparatus as biopower and, as mentioned above, socialization in the family—while still claiming to represent society as

a whole (Negt and Kluge 1993 [1972], xlvi). Thus they deem Habermas's bourgeois public sphere as essentially useless for working-class struggles due to the workers' position within the context of the modern nuclear family, the influence of mass media, biased working-class organizations, and the Consciousness Industry in general (ibid., 30–4). In brief, they see little hope that the experiences and interests of the proletariat will be able to organize themselves under current conditions of capitalism since bourgeois society has constituted the public sphere essentially as a crystallization point of its own experience and ideologies (ibid., xlvii). What is needed instead, Negt and Kluge suggest, is a newly conceptualized *proletarian public sphere*, which they define as "the autonomous, collective organization of the experiences specific to workers" (ibid., 28). Furthermore, they choose "the proletariat" as the name for that collective organization because they recognize that this concept is "antiquated and therefore ostensibly resilient to the influence of dominant discourses" (Langston 2020, 305).

Another major theme in *Public Sphere and Experience* that is crucial for assessing the intelligentsia's role in society is the authors' investigation of the life-historical construction of experience. By including experience in their analysis, Negt and Kluge claim that the concept of the public sphere governs a far greater area of social life than it does in Habermas, who tends to reduce it to the relatively specialized institutions of the nascent media (newspapers, public opinion, "representative" or parliamentary debate, etc.) (Jameson 2008, 199). To explain their expansion of the concept, Negt and Kluge differentiate between immediate and mediated experiences. Immediate experiences, on the one hand, do not lead to an appropriation and accumulation of knowledge and are

determined by the context of living (Negt and Kluge 1993 [1972], 27). They are thus experiences that are fairly independent from intellectuals. Mediated experiences, on the other hand, are scholarly and scientific formulations about experience (ibid., 28). As I noted above, Marx stresses the former arguing that the liberation of the worker can only be the task of the workers themselves, which according to Negt and Kluge is only possible in the framework of a proletarian public sphere (ibid.). This, in consequence, has implications for the role of intellectuals within the liberation struggle against capitalism, because they are critical for bridging between mediated and immediate knowledge and hence for rendering this expanded public sphere articulate and conscious.

This action, however, is not unproblematic. Institutionalized (including mediated) and specialized knowledges, Negt and Kluge suggest, have traditionally constituted themselves within the structure of domination of existing capitalist forces and develop themselves as specialized productive forces at supplementary levels of production (ibid., 23). Going back to Adorno's warning mentioned above, intellectuals thus risk being "at once the last enemies of the bourgeois and the last bourgeois" (2005 [1951], 46). Negt and Kluge assert that the intelligentsia's conceptual emancipatory forms are a separation of knowledge from collective human interests and thus in themselves a phenomenon of alienation, a type of abstraction that removes it from direct participation in the public sphere (1993 [1972], 41). Consequently, academic language reproduces the experience of the intelligentsia but excludes that of the working class (ibid.). Put brief, institutionalized and mediated experiences are limited in their support for proletarian struggles. The intelligentsia would only be helpful if its type of labor and the knowledge it produces could

be collectively transformed and rebuilt within the experiential context of the working class (ibid.). Negt and Kluge thus share Marx's assessment of the limitations of theoretical knowledge:

> Theory is only realized in a people so far as it fulfils the needs of the people. Will there correspond to the monstrous discrepancy between the demands of German thought and the answers of German reality a similar discrepancy between civil society and the state, and within civil society itself? Will theoretical needs be directly practical needs? It is not enough that thought should seek to realize itself; reality must also strive towards thought. (1978a [1844], 61)

The significance in Negt and Kluge's extension of the notion of the public sphere, as Jameson argues, is that "while continuing to include the institutional referents of Habermas's history," they seek to "widen the notion in such a way as to secure its constitutive relationship to the very possibility of social or individual experience in general" (Jameson 2008, 199). Moreover, Negt and Kluge stress the bodily and sensual/sensuous enmeshment of proletarian consciousness as well as the ways in which these sensuous necessities are appropriated and displaced by the dominant media (ibid., 215). By doing so, these media could contribute to "the Utopian effort to produce a discursive space of a new type" (ibid., 200).

Without attempting to resolve any disputes regarding the public sphere, my brief comparison above about possible different concepts of its bourgeois and its proletarian forms does highlight once again opposing approaches to consciousness-raising in Marxist debates around "1968." In the following sections, therefore, I will examine a selection of

representative contributions in *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* to demonstrate how these journals engaged in discussions regarding the public sphere and its intellectual/bourgois and proletarian agents, and how their differing stances furthermore typify their attempts to create an open and critical stage for Marxism. Did they perceive themselves as an open space in which arguments are freely shared in the name of "progress," or did the journals actually acknowledge the dialectical relationship between class struggle, intellectual experience, and the public sphere?

KURSBUCH'S BOURGEOIS CLASS STRUGGLE

Starting with *Kursbuch*'s initial publication in June 1965, the intellectual's role within the anti-capitalist class struggle was a reoccurring yet arguably mostly one-sided theme in its pages. This comes as no surprise: as mentioned above, the aim of the "documentary turn" of the 1960s was to reveal "facts of social existence" and "deeper truths about contemporary society" through documentary genres while discrediting "high-cultural literature" and the "bourgeois press" (Brown 2013, 144–5). Yet this debate about documentary was more concerned about *genres* and their strategies of representation rather than *agents* and, in the spirit of the *Realism-Modernism Debate*, about the "correct" way for intellectual labor to meet audiences. As I will show below, the question for *Kursbuch* was not between proletarian *or* bourgeois public sphere, as emphasized by Negt and Kluge, but between *revolutionary* and *counterrevolutionary* intellectuals within a Habermasian bourgeois public sphere. That is, the literary magazine made no pretenses at reading beyond its genre's traditional reading class, but sought instead to define political agency.

The emphasis on revolutionary versus counterrevolutionary, yet in both cases *intellectual* agents becomes clear in *Kursbuch* #1's dossier "Streit um Worte" [Dispute over Words], which documents an argument between the two French intellectuals Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–80) and Claude Simon (1913–2005). Sartre can be understood as Enzensberger's "international alter ego": both traveled the world self-labeled as engaged intellectuals, and both considered the so-called Third World as an important site for revolutionary progress (Weitbrecht 2012, 107–8). I therefore make the case below that Sartre's deliberations on the role of intellectuals resemble Enzensberger's own positions and that Claude Simon was purposefully portrayed as the type of counterrevolutionary intellectual that ought to be rejected by engaged Marxists. In essence, *Kursbuch* is a carefully edited collage of voices played against each other, intending to support Enzensberger's political visions outlined in chapter 2.

The first part of the dossier is an interview with Sartre by French journalist Jacqueline Piatier (1921–2001), which first appeared in the French newspaper *Le Monde* on April 18, 1964.[1] In it, Sartre shares Enzensberger's action-driven agenda by situating himself "on the side of those who think that things will go better when the world has changed" (Sartre and Piatier 1964, 62). Sartre discards intellectuals whose work does not advocate direct political change, such as Samuel Beckett ("I admire Beckett, but I am totally against him. He seeks no improvement.") or André Gide (1869–1951), particularly the latter's novel *The Fruits of the Earth* (1897):

[1] *Kursbuch* published the interview in German. The English translation I use was printed as "'A Long, Bitter, Sweet Madness': An Interview with Jean-Paul Sartre" in the British literary magazine *Encounter* in 1964.

> Today[,] I consider *Les Nourritures Terrestres* as a frightening book: "Look for God in no other place than everywhere." Go and tell that to a workman, an engineer! Gide can say it to me: it is a writer's morality only addressed to a few privileged people. For that reason[,] it no longer interests me. First all men must be able to become men by the improvement of their conditions of existence, so that a universal morality can be created. […] What matters first is the liberation of man. (ibid.)

Sartre's argument here anticipates the strategy that Enzensberger and Michel would later advocate in *Kursbuch* #15 when they allege bourgeois authors of being detached from real-world working-class struggles and bourgeois art consequently as socially purposeless (see chapter 4). Especially the last part of the quote resembles what I have called anti-modernist Marxist "realism 2.0" (i.e. the only task of intellectual labor is to reveal the industrialization of the mind through documentary realism; see chapter 3)—any other approach to literary productions is condemned as counterrevolutionary.

Sartre then denounces his own earlier works, such as his 1938 novel *Nausea*, arguing that this kind of intellectual labor would not help people who suffer materially: "I have slowly learned to experience reality. I have seen children dying of hunger. Over against a dying child[,] *La Nausée* cannot act as a counterweight" (ibid.). This self-criticism leads Sartre to his deliberations on how intellectuals should frame their work in response to the world:

> That is exactly the writer's problem. What does literature stand for in a hungry world? Like morality, literature needs to be universal. So that the writer must put himself on the side of the majority, of the two billion starving, if he wishes to be

> able to speak to all and be read by all. Failing that, he is at the service of a privileged class and, like it, an exploiter. To find this total public he has two ways: the momentary renunciation of literature in order to educate the people […] If he preferred to write novels in Europe, his attitude would appear to me verging on treason. […] The second way, applicable in our non-revolutionary societies, to prepare for the time when everyone will read, is to pose problems in the most radical and intransigent manner. (ibid.)

In calling "art for art's sake" a treason to suffering people, Sartre's anti-bourgeois attitude not only echoes Enzensberger's public program throughout the 1960s, the French Marxist furthermore continues to set clear guidelines for intellectuals: "As long as the writer cannot write for the two billion men who are hungry, he will be oppressed by a feeling of *malaise*" (ibid.). Similar to *Kursbuch*'s radical dogmatism around 1968, Sartre leaves no room for alternative positions: "What I ask of him [the intellectual] is not to ignore the reality and the fundamental problems that exist. The world's hunger, the atomic threat, the alienation of man, I am astonished that they do not colour all our literature" (ibid.).

The similarities in Sartre's argument and *Kursbuch*'s radicalization are evident. The French Marxist's conclusion that "Heroism is not to be won at the point of a pen" (ibid.) typifies the anti-art-for-art's-sake agenda of the late 1960s as well as many Marxists' frustrations with the apolitical Western bourgeois literary tradition. As I have shown throughout the previous chapters, such calls for battle and change are at the heart of *Kursbuch*'s first publication years. The scorn for bourgeois intellectualism not only provided guidance for what Sartre, Enzensberger, and their sympathizers thought they

should do, it also formed an image of an intellectual enemy. In the case of *Kursbuch* #1, that adversary was the stereotypical established intellectual, personified in this debate as Claude Simon. The latter was portrayed in *Kursbuch* as an anti-Marxist and counterrevolutionary defender of the exploitative status quo. A translation of Simon's article "Pour qui écrit Sartre?" that was originally published in the French magazine *L'Express* on May 28, 1964, illustrates that exact purpose.[2]

Simon's article has two main parts. First, he rejects calls for politicizing literature while defending the premise of art for art's sake. The second part is an attack on Marxism and Sartre. In other words, Simon argues against everything that is on *Kursbuch*'s agenda. He begins with Roland Barthes's distinction between "*l'écrivain* (the writer) and '*l'écrivant*' (someone who just happens to write)" (Simon 1964, 57). Whereas the latter only "performs an activity […] for political or other ends," the former actually "fulfils a function": the writer operates as a transmitter of a "higher" independent language, which has "its own lines of force" (ibid.). Such an *idealist* understanding of thought manifesting itself in the material is in stark contrast to the traditional Marxist premise that material conditions are not only preceding but also conditioning the thought. Presumably, given the predominantly Marxist target audience of *Kursbuch*, such an argument aims to cause dissent against Simon and deliver a comprehensible image of an undesirable anti-thesis to Sartre and Enzensberger. Same can be said about Simon's defense of writing for the sake of writing without any direction or political purpose:

[2] *Kursbuch* published the article in German. The English translation I use was printed as "Whom DOES Sartre Write For?" in *The London Magazine* in 1964.

> The writer sets out on a voyage of exploration, a dangerous adventure in the course of which he must feel his way with the utmost care. Why does he do it? Probably because he feels a need to create *something*—what he is not too sure. He wants above all to write, just as the painter feels above all the need to paint […] The writer and the painter set out, like Columbus, to discover a world, but it is another, unexpected world that they find. (ibid.)

Questionable colonial references aside (the subsequent *Kursbuch* #2 was one of many anti-colonial special issues), this argument in favor of intellectual exploration without a clear goal is precisely the bourgeois attitude that Enzensberger aimed to combat.

What follows is Simon's discrediting of Sartre's political call that intellectuals should direct their work towards suffering people:

> Does Sartre believe it is the undernourish[ed] masses who have placed *Les Mots* at the top of the bestseller lists or that over against a dying child his book can act as a 'counterweight', to use the striking expression he has himself borrowed from the sublanguage of coinage? When were corpses and books ever weighed on the same scales? Why write at all, why publish? (ibid., 59)

Any ambition to utilize literature for political change, Simon argues, would not only be hypocritical but generate dangerous dogmatisms:

> It is curious how Marxist societies have the same brutal, stupid, frightened, defensive reflexes as bourgeois ones. […] In the shadow of ignorance and fear, one kills. One then strikes a match, only to find that there was nothing there—but sometimes it is the body of a friend. […] It is perhaps time that those who believe

they have been given the mission of 'enlightening' the world, should strike the match first. It would be preferable to continually trying to blow it out. (ibid., 61).

In other words, Simon suggests that intellectuals should know their place and stick to their bourgeois limitations rather than striving for political change. Any Marxist effort and political art would consequently be counterproductive. Given the nature of *Kursbuch* and its editors' stances throughout the 1960s, Simon's attacks on Marxism and Sartre are from the start purposefully planted to ridicule Simon rather than constituting an actual dialog. Simon represents everything that *Kursbuch* is not, or at least pretends not to be. The message that Enzensberger communicates in this dossier section is not to present an argument between two intellectuals, but to be partisan towards Sartre (who takes up twenty-four dossier pages versus Simon's eight pages) and toward the idea that the bourgeois public sphere might sustain political discourse.

It is important to reemphasize that Sartre was discrediting his own earlier works, in no small part to reclaim relevance of his own work in an era of growing Marxist critiques. His notion of an engaged intellectual is thus presented as a new type of intellectual, rejecting not only the apolitical bourgeois intellectual but also previous manifestations of the Marxist "Old" Left. As I will argue below, *Kursbuch*'s first issue most likely portrays the dispute between Sartre and Simon, accompanied by an essay of the journal's co-editor Michel, in order to create a guideline for a "New Left" intellectual while simultaneously rejecting all "outdated" versions of Marxist (or another leftist) intellectualism.

That the debate is used strategically rather than substantially is, however, clear. *Kursbuch* co-editor Michel discusses the "failures" of pre-1965 intellectuals meticulously

in his *Kursbuch* #1 contribution "Die sprachlose Intelligenz" [The Mute Intelligence], which is the first part of an essay series that was eventually published as a book with the same title in 1968. With forty-seven pages, presumably the longest essay ever printed in *Kursbuch*, Michel lists opposing positions of over thirty different intellectuals on the intelligentsia's role in society.

This concatenation of conflicting stances by mostly German and French thinkers stretching from the French Revolution to the mid-twentieth century includes positions regarding the intellectual's estrangement from society (with references to, among others, Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Vladimir Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Georg Lukács, Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Max Weber, Robert Michels, Max Scheler, Arnold Gehlen, Montesquieu, Rudolf Hilferding, and Emil Lederer [Michel 1965, 96–8]). Michel furthermore juxtaposes positions on the intellectual's role of enlightening and educating the masses (including Alexis de Tocqueville and Hippolyte Taine [ibid., 98–9]); the economic influence on intellectuals (Eduard Reich, Stendhal, Barthélemy Prosper Enfantin, Adam Smith, Friedrich List [ibid., 99–100]); the intellectual's social prestige (Henri de Saint-Simon and Auguste Comte [ibid., 100–1]); opinions on the intellectual's lack of educational impact (Gustave Flaubert, Edmond de Goncourt, Jules Vallès [ibid., 102]); and, lastly, debates on the importance of discipline and moral conscientiousness for intellectual labor (Ernest Renan, Léon Gambetta, Mikhail Bakunin, Alexander Herzen, Charles Sorel, Friedrich Nietzsche, Henri Bergson, and Charles Péguy [ibid., 102–6]).

I argue that this overwhelming list of names and opinions does not intend to provide space for a discussion on the actual arguments that these intellectuals were making. I rather

suspect that Michel's point is that the list of arguments is so overwhelming to the extent that the arguments themselves are pointless—his audience is not to react by adducing Marxist positions or social-political positions outside Marxism that the present essay "forget." To support this assumption, let me briefly go into the first subject on Michel's enumeration—the intellectual's estrangement from society—to illustrate what the *Kursbuch* co-editor is trying to achieve.

Michel starts off with the following quote from "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Introduction," in which Marx highlights the dialectical relationship between philosophical thought (i.e. intellectual labor) and socialist praxis:

> Just as philosophy finds its *material* weapons in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its *intellectual* weapons in philosophy. And once the lightening of thought has penetrated deeply into this virgin soil of the people, the *Germans* will emancipate themselves and become *men*. (1978a [1844], 65)[3]

Michel scaffolds this quote to explain what he considers Vladimir Lenin's revolutionary strategy during the Russian Revolution, which Michel accuses of being put together by dictatorial and authoritarian "professional revolutionaries," who were only pretending to lead the workers to socialism. This tactic was, as Michel subsequently outlines, heavily criticized by Rosa Luxemburg.[4] Michel then discusses Rosa Luxemburg's critique of Lenin and the Bolsheviks, quoting from her essay "Leninism or Marxism?" (1904):

---

[3] *Kursbuch* published Marx's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *The Marx-Engels Reader* (New York: Norton, 1978).

[4] Original German quote: "Bei der Analyse der bolschewistischen Organisationspläne stieß Rosa Luxemburg auf das von Lenin geflissentlich ausgesparte, durch seine Forderung 'Bürokratie statt Demokratie' eskamotierte Problem der Vermittlung zwischen bewußtem und spontanem Element, intellektueller Vorhut und Arbeiterschaft. Diese ist nach der orthodoxen Auffassung der Träger einer

> Knocked to the ground, almost reduced to dust, by Russian absolutism, the "ego" takes revenge by turning to revolutionary activity. In the shape of a committee of conspirators, in the name of a nonexistent Will of the People, it seats itself on a kind of throne and proclaims it is all-powerful. (1961 [1904], 107)[5]

Luxemburg's critique of Lenin insists that only a social-democratic movement driven by a society's antagonistic conditions can be revolutionarily effective (Michel 1965, 87–8). Michel then contradicts Luxemburg's condemnation of Lenin through Georg Lukács's deliberations on the relationship between "the few that make the revolution" and "the many for whom the revolution is made," which requires an interdependency of Luxemburg's spontaneity *and* Lenin's regulation (ibid., 88–9). The *Kursbuch* co-editor then quotes the following passage from Lukács's *History and Class Consciousness* (1923) that highlights the importance of an organized party for socialist causes:

> This conflict between individual and class consciousness in every single worker is by no means a matter of chance. For the Communist Party shows itself here to be superior to every other party organisation in two ways: firstly, for the first time in history the active and practical side of class consciousness *directly* influences the specific actions of every individual, and secondly, at the same time it *consciously* helps to determine the historical process. (1971a [1923], 318)[6]

---

historischen Mission, aber der Träger ist blind, sieht nur seine unmittelbaren, nicht seine wahren Interessen und kann aus eigener Kraft nur zu gewerkschaftlicher, nicht zur politischen Aktion gelangen. Deshalb, so argumentierte Lenin, muß eine Gruppe von Berufsrevolutionären das Proletariat führen: diktatorisch, autoritär" (Michel 1965, 87).

[5] *Kursbuch* published Luxemburg's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *The Russian Revolution and Leninism or Marxism?* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1961).

[6] *Kursbuch* published Lukács's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971).

The overriding argument for Lukács is that the development of class consciousness requires a form of discipline which has to be facilitated through an organized party: "The *conscious* desire for the realm of freedom […] implies the conscious subordination of the self to that collective will that is destined to bring real freedom into being […] This conscious collective will is the Communist Party" (ibid., 315). As Michel outlines, this argument is grounded in the metaphysical dogmatic belief that the proletariat is inevitably a revolutionary force, lacking simply a medium or center through which its capacity to act can be deployed. Closing the circle of arguments, this subsequently brings Michel back to Marx and the following passage from "The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism: Against Bruno Bauer and Company" (1845):

> It is not a question of what this or that proletarian, or even the whole proletariat, at the moment *regards* as its aim. It is a question of *what the proletariat is*, and what, in accordance with this *being*, it will historically be compelled to do. (2010 [1845], 37)[7]

The reason why Michel commits several pages to the dispute between Lenin, Lukács, and Luxemburg while tracing their arguments back and forth in dialogue with Marx is not to determine who has the better arguments. I argue instead that Michel wants to make at least two more significant points. First, he attempts to illustrate that the inherited debates of how to organize the proletariat are trapped in a circle that cannot be overcome. And second, these debates used in his present would only serve as proxy arguments highlighting an underlying dispute about dogmas within the European Left, in which the subject matter is

[7] *Kursbuch* published Marx's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *Marx & Engels: Collected Works, Volume 4: Marx and Engels 1844–45* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2010).

not the organization of/or the party, but actually about the intelligentsia reflecting on its own historical role.[8] That realization, I argue, is the actual core of Michel's essay. He is using this proxy argument to document the inner disunity of "Old" Left intellectuals striving for socialism. Party organization is, according to Michel, a coping mechanism for intellectuals who realized that the workers turned their backs on the revolution.[9] The inherited socialist imagination, he also argues, is also just another coping mechanism for intellectuals who assume their calling in a distant future in order to handle the fact that their own existence ought to be questioned in light of failed and bloody revolutions.[10]

Underlying all these arguments is the estrangement of intellectuals, which Michel highlights with the following quote from Marx's "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts

---

[8] Original German quote: "In der Kontroverse zwischen Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg und Lukács über Organisationsfragen, an der sich viele andere beteiligten, gewinnt der während der französischen Revolution akut gewordene Antagonismus innerhalb der europäischen Intelligenz den Charakter eines Dogmenstreites, der Weltgeschichte macht. Streitobjekt ist letzten Endes nicht die Organisation sondern das Bewußtsein, nicht die Partei sondern die Intelligenz, die ihre geschichtliche Rolle reflektiert" (Michel 1965, 90).

[9] Original German quote: "An wen sollte sich der sozialistische Intellektuelle halten, nachdem der Arbeiter ihn im Stich gelassen hatte? [...] Den Proletkult durch den Parteikult zu ersetzen, bedeutete für den Intellektuellen, daß er Intellektueller bleiben durfte, sich nicht mehr gedrungen fühlte, durch ein sacrificium intellectus das Manko seiner Klassenfremdheit auszugleichen, um der proletarischen Weihen würdig zu werden. [...] Jetzt blieb ihnen dieser Inferioritätskomplex erspart, zugleich auch das schlechte Gewissen darüber, daß sie die ausgebeuteten Arbeiter auch noch für die Befreiung der Menschheit ausbeuten wollten" (ibid., 92).

[10] Original German quote: "Wie macht man Geschichte? Wie verändert man die gesellschaftliche Wirklichkeit im Sinne der eigenen Wünsche, Gedanken, Theorien? Und wer soll für die Verwirklichung aufkommen? Wo sollen die unerläßlichen Abstriche gemacht werden – an der Freiheit, der Gleichheit oder der Gerechtigkeit? An der Vernunft oder am Glück? Die Intellektuellen des 20. Jahrhunderts, die diese Fragen lösen wollen, scheinen sich im Kreise zu drehen, angetrieben vom Wunsch, ein fernes Ziel zu erreichen, vom schlechten Gewissen wegen der Mittel, vom Bedürfnis sie zu rechtfertigen, vom Selbstbestrafungszwang, vom Selbsterhaltungstrieb" (ibid., 93). Michel continues: "Er [Intellektuelle] muß auf eine utopische Zukunft spekulieren, die ihn bestätigt, indem sie seine individuelle Intelligenz entweder in der allgemeinen 'aufhebt' oder über die allgemeine setzt. Beides läuft auf Diktatur hinaus, sei's der Vielen, sei's der Wenigen, und das verträgt sich schlecht mit dem Liberalismus, der den urwüchsigen Kapitalismus überwölbt" (ibid., 95).

of 1844," first published in 1932 *after* the dispute between Lenin, Lukács, and Luxemburg. Marx argues: "The *philosopher* sets up himself (that is, one who is himself an abstract form of estranged man) as the *measuring-rod* of the estranged world" (1978b [1932], 110).[11] Michel double-downs on that argument with a quote from Hegelian philosopher Alexandre Kojève (1902–68):

> In short, being neither Master nor Slave, he [the intellectual] is able […] to "realize" in some way the desired synthesis of Mastery and Slavery: he can *conceive* it. However, being *neither* Master *nor* Slave—that is, abstaining from all Work and from all Fighting—he cannot truly *realize* the synthesis that he discovers: without Fighting and without Work, this synthesis conceived by the Intellectual remains purely *verbal*. (1980 [1947], 68)[12]

Put briefly, after pages of discussing how an intellectual should (not) be involved in socialist causes, Michel ends the discussion by concluding that the intellectual is politically impotent, and so are all arguments by intellectuals trying to attest to their influence. In this logic, Michel intends to illustrate how the "old" intelligentsia is its own obstacle and responsible for its estrangement and *mute intelligence* (as the essay title suggests). The detachment, distance, and isolation from the "real world" is both the intelligentsia's distinctive feature and its powerlessness. Michel again cites as an historical example of this intellectual weakness the intelligentsia's inability to be a "serious political disturbing factor" during the rise of fascism. After all, fascists were able, Michel argues, to achieve

[11] *Kursbuch* published Marx's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *The Marx-Engels Reader* (New York: Norton, 1978).
[12] *Kursbuch* published Kojève's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980).

what the "old" Marxist Left only talked about: mobilizing the masses and transforming their consciousness.[13] The *Kursbuch* co-editor concludes that it is not society which is emancipated through its intelligentsia, but rather social reality that emancipates (i.e. frees, disbands, liberates) the intellectuals from their self-asserted critical function.[14] The great revolutions are done and left nothing behind but "sozialistischen Schutt" [socialist debris] for the "speaking yet muted intelligentsia" (1965, 114–5).

What Michel does not offer, however, is an alternative path or direction. He does not say whether the fight against capitalism and fascism should be quit altogether (but given Michel's other writings, that seems likely not to be the case; see chapter 4). The *Kursbuch* co-editor also does not say whether the workers should alter their political behavior or organization in any way (generally speaking, Negt's and Kluge's proletarian public sphere seems to be of no relevance to *Kursbuch*). What I consider more probable is that Michel implicitly calls for a new kind of intellectual labor—a New Left—given the "Old" Left's past failures. In doing so, Michel's essay is in line with Sartre's move to discredit his own earlier work in order to take a new direction.

While this call might be read as reactionary as much as revolutionary, Michel's critique of the "Old" Left and his indirect calling for a "New" Left refine themselves with

---

[13] Original German quote: "Was den Fortschritt betrifft, sind die deutschen Intellektuellen exkulpiert. Überhaupt, sie rühren nicht gern an bestehende Autoritäten und haben sich noch nie als ernster politischer Störungsfaktor erwiesen, am wenigstens 1933. […] Das Beispiel dieser kollektiven Regression mußte der europäischen Intelligenz schockhaft zeigen, daß die Umwandlung eines gesellschaftlichen Körpers und die Umerziehung der Menschen desto besser gelingen, je weniger dabei Vernunft und Humanität im Spiele sind. Der Faschismus war, was Aufklärung und Sozialismus sein wollten: eine Bewegung, die die Massen erfaßte, ihr Bewußtsein umformte" (Michel 1965, 110).

[14] Original German quote: "Die Emanzipation der Gesellschaft von ihrer Intelligenz wird in unserem Jahrhundert übertrumpft durch die Emanzipation der gesellschaftlichen Wirklichkeit von jeder kritischen Reflektion auf sie" (ibid., 114).

the advancing politicization of West Germany's students—and with *Kursbuch*'s own goals. With more and more young people becoming radicalized (a process that *Kursbuch* actively contributed to; see chapter 1 and 2), Enzensberger and Michel deemed it necessary for this emerging New Left movement to undergo a critical analysis, too, if a new politics were to emerge. *Kursbuch* #6, published in July 1966, thematizes the US protests against the Vietnam War. Taking this non-parliamentary "Western" protest movement, concerned about atrocities in the "non-Western" world, as its point of departure, the magazine ends with a debate between Peter Weiss and Hans Magnus Enzensberger on partisanship and the role of engaged intellectuals. The "Old" Left was declared dead and mute in previous *Kursbuch* issues—but what should the "New" Left of the developed world be doing? In other words, what limitations and responsibilities do Western intellectuals face with respect to struggles outside their bourgeois public? Weiss and Enzensberger, arguably, were voices that could lead beyond bankrupt intellectual strategies. And *Kursbuch* works to restage the inherited debates for the new political environment post-1968, where intellectuals could not be simply dismissed.

Peter Weiss's contribution is a reaction to Enzensberger's essay "Europäische Peripherie" [European Periphery] that was published in *Kursbuch* #2 (August 1965)—an issue committed entirely to anti-capitalist struggles in the so-called Third World. In the article, Enzensberger argues that the real divide in world politics is between North and South, rich and poor—at the time, a bold proposition in divided Germany (Parkes 2009, 77). Weiss rejects that division by claiming that, considering the oppressed masses within rich countries, one should rather divide the world into capitalism and socialism (P. Weiss

and Enzensberger 1966, 167). According to Weiss, intellectuals in capitalist countries have a vital role to play in non-Western capitalist struggles.

In reference to the latter, Weiss argues that intellectuals in developed nations have the ability (and thus responsibility) to understand the struggles outside the "European Periphery" in a way that those affected by them cannot, due to educational deficits.[15] Writers such as Weiss himself should therefore gather knowledge about the oppressive conditions in other parts of the world in order to build solidarity.[16] West German authors, Weiss continues, should focus their attention on how the FRG's economic and military interests are reflected in Third World foreign policies—this way, intellectuals would illustrate how they are themselves reflected in struggles that appear to be fought far away.[17] In brief, Weiss's main point is that Western intellectuals have to consider anti-capitalist and military investments in other parts of the world as their own struggles (ibid., 170).

However, despite demanding solidarity, Weiss does not say what strategies Western intellectuals should implement to express their solidarity (except by writing about it and uncovering economic injustices by developed nations). This unanswered question sets the baseline for Enzensberger's response, which accuses Weiss and like-minded

---

[15] Original German quote: "In manchen Fällen können wir als Schreib- und Lesekundige sogar mehr von den Verhältnissen verstehen und überblicken, als jene, die ohne jegliche Bildungsmöglichkeit von ihnen zerrieben werden" (P. Weiss and Enzensberger 1966, 165–6).

[16] Original German quote: "Indem wir uns soviel Kenntnisse wie möglich verschaffen über die Zustände in den von den 'Reichen' am schwersten bedrängten Ländern, können wir diese Länder in unsere Nähe rücken und unsere Solidarität mit ihnen entwickeln" (ibid., 168).

[17] Original German quote: "Für einen westdeutschen Autor z.B. besteht die Möglichkeit, zu untersuchen, in welchem Maß die Infiltration der Großwirtschaft und der militärischen Interessen seines Staats in den unterdrückten Ländern fortgeschritten ist. Da zeigt es sich bald, wie eng er mit den Geschehnissen dort verbunden ist" (ibid.).

intellectuals of not having an agenda, goal, or strategy.[18] Instead, the *Kursbuch* founder attacks Weiss for favoring a Marxist class reductionism that wrongly assumes that anti-capitalist liberation could be achieved through starry-eyed idealism and material abdication.[19]

Enzensberger rejects intellectual debates and lip service by Westerners regarding liberation struggles in the so-called Third World. These conflicts, he insists, would not be about differences in opinions but rather about dying people.[20] Researching conflicts in a foreign country, he argues, is not the same as being part of the struggle locally (ibid., 176). The *Kursbuch* editor here once again casts himself as in agreement with Sartre, whose reminder that "Heroism is not to be won at the point of a pen" is even quoted towards the end of the article. Enzensberger concludes the essay with the rejection of what he considers self-serving but impotent solidarity by intellectuals from capitalist countries:

---

[18] Original German quote: "Ist Peter Weiss ein Reformist? Oder plant er für die Bundesrepublik eine Revolution? Fragen über Fragen. Peter Weiss läßt sie ohne Antwort. [...] Er weiß es selber nicht. Er hat weder ein Programm vorzuschlagen, noch eine Strategie. Eine politische Entscheidung aber, die keine präzisen Ziele kennt, bleibt leer; eine politische Entscheidung ohne präzise Strategie bleibt blind" (ibid., 172).

[19] Original German quote: "Der politische Palmström ist ein Idealist, wie er im Buche steht, und es gehört offensichtlich zu seinem Projekt, die Marxsche Philosophie auf den Kopf zu stellen. Das vereinfacht den Klassenkampf beträchtlich. Wir brauchen nur, jeder einzelne für sich, bis die ganze Menschheit desgleichen tut, unsere Charakterfehler abzustreifen und uns für Die Gute Sache zu entscheiden, unserm Egoismus Valet zu sagen, uns zu erheben über unsere niedrigen materiellen Interessen, so wird die klassenlose Gesellschaft nicht mehr lange auf sich warten lassen" (ibid., 173).

[20] Original German quote: "Der Fall ist lächerlich, aber er ist nicht komisch. Hier geht es nicht um ein paar Schriftsteller und ihre Meinungsverschiedenheiten. Daß der eine dem andern "Wirklichkeitsfälschung" vorwirft, der eine dem andern blinde Naivität, möchte jeden, der lesen kann, kalt lassen. Es ist aber hier von Fragen die Rede, die blutig sind; wovon wir reden, daran sterben viele Leute; darum handelt es sich, nicht um Kindereien, und deshalb muß ein Abgrund Abgrund genannt werden, Reichtum Reichtum, Interesse Interesse, und was ein furchtbarer Riß ist, ein Riß" (ibid.).

> I can do without left-wing Moral Rearmament. I am not an idealist. I prefer arguments to feelings. I prefer doubts to convictions. Revolutionary prattle is anathema to me. I do not need one-dimensional world views. In cases of doubt, reality decides. (quoted in Parkes 2009, 78)[21]

Similar to Weiss (and Michel), Enzensberger does not say what intellectuals should be doing in light of atrocities such as the Vietnam War. All he does is criticize Weiss's opinion within *Kursbuch*'s quasi-bourgeois public sphere while at the same time celebrating Christmas privately with the Weiss family in the sanctuary of the safe European home (Niese 2017, 188). As we shall see below, *Kursbuch*'s guidelines for engaged intellectuals and their responsibilities become more apparent when events in Western Europe and North America themselves escalate in the course of the student rebellion—the *Kursbuch* editorial board is trying to cut off the reemergence of this kind of resistance by the pen alone. To amplify *Kursbuch*'s critique, I will examine two more articles through which Enzensberger and Michel stage the next insights in evolving their counterproposal: "The Responsibility of Intellectuals" by Noam Chomsky (*Kursbuch* #9, 1967) and Enzensberger's "Berlin Commonplaces" (*Kursbuch* #11, 1968). I begin with Noam Chomsky's (1928–) essay on the ascertainment of intellectual responsibilities.

Kursbuch reveals already in the essay's translation its intentions for printing it. Whereas the original English title is "The Responsibility of Intellectuals," the German version is translated to "Vietnam und die Redlichkeit des Intellektuellen" [Vietnam and the Intellectual's Integrity]. This translation emphasizes both its urgent topicality (referencing

[21] *Kursbuch* published Enzensberger's quote in German. The English translation is taken from Stuart Parkes's *Writers and Politics in Germany, 1945–2008* (Rochester: Camden House, 2009).

the Vietnam War) and a shift toward the magazine's own definition of the role of the intellectual: accountability (intellectual labor is not just responsibility *for others* but integrity *for oneself*). Chomsky's essay thus serves as a "very active US American addition" to *Kursbuch*'s agenda (Niese 2017, 218). In the redactorial notes, Enzensberger and Michel even emphasize that the essay was the first time Chomsky wrote a public statement about the politics of the day—a powerful symbol of the Western intellectual leaving the academic ivory tower. If we understand *Kursbuch*'s aim as replacing "intellectual isolation" with "collective engagement" (ibid.), then "The Responsibility of Intellectuals" is a logical extension of earlier arguments like Michel's "The Mute Intelligence," discussed above.

Regarding the context of the essay, Chomsky stated over fifty years after its initial publication:

> The essay itself was really a talk given in early 1966, about a year before it appeared, to a student group at Harvard University […] Since this talk happened to be at Harvard, it was particularly important to focus on intellectual elites and their relation to government. The reason was that the Harvard faculty was quite prominent in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. (2019, 5)

Chomsky's essay intends to formulate "an attack on experts, technocrats[,] and intellectuals of all kinds who serve the interests of the powerful by lying, by producing propaganda or by providing 'pseudo-scientific justifications for the crimes of the state'" (Allott 2019, 1). He understands the particular responsibility of intellectuals first and foremost justified in their position within society:

> Intellectuals are in a position to expose the lies of governments, to analyze actions according to their causes and motives and often hidden intentions. In the Western world, at least, they have the power that comes from political liberty, from access to information and freedom of expression. For a privileged minority, Western democracy provides the leisure, the facilities, and the training to seek the truth lying hidden behind the veil of distortion and misrepresentation, ideology and class interest, through which the events of current history are presented to us. The responsibilities of intellectuals, then, are much deeper than […] the "responsibilities of peoples," given the unique privileges that intellectuals enjoy. (Chomsky 1967, 16)[22]

Chomsky commiserates that too many intellectuals serve dominant ideologies rather than unmask the "the power of the government's propaganda apparatus" (ibid.) or "the unconstrained viciousness that the mass media present to us each day" (ibid., 18). He refers to examples of conservative intellectuals such as German philosopher Martin Heidegger (1889–1976, convicted as a Nazi sympathizer and temporarily removed from his job as a professor) as well as liberal yet anti-communist and pro-establishment intellectuals such as the American historian Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. (1917–2007, who worked in the Kennedy administration) to show that "the responsibility of intellectuals to speak the truth and to expose lies […] is not at all obvious" to "the modern intellectual" (ibid., 16).

Chomsky argues against such influential and affluent intellectuals who are "accepting society" and promoting the values that are honored within this society; he

[22] *Kursbuch* published Chomsky's text in German. All quotes are taken from the original English version "The Responsibility of Intellectuals," published in *The New York Review of Books* in 1967.

disputes "the scholar-experts who are replacing the free-floating intellectuals of the past," and he condemns the university scholar experts who construct a "value-free technology" for societies contemporary problems based on a "responsible stance" (ibid., 23). Instead, Chomsky insists that the intellectual has to create an "intellectual and moral climate" and "the social and economic conditions" that allow participation in the process of modernization and development which corresponds to Western material wealth and technical capacity (ibid.). In the original, he ends his essay with the following quote by cultural critic Dwight Macdonald (1906–82), which interestingly got omitted from the *Kursbuch* translation: "Only those who are willing to resist authority themselves when it conflicts too intolerably with their personal moral code, only they have the right to condemn the death-camp paymaster" (ibid., 26). In short, Chomsky's essay calls for active participation in the public sphere: the intellectual has to "insist upon the truth" and a "duty to see events in their historical perspective" (ibid., 25). The intellectual can no longer "create, or mouth, or tolerate the deceptions that will be used to justify the next defense of freedom" (ibid., 26). In light of the Vietnam War, Chomsky seems to suggest that there is no justification for what *Kursbuch* co-editor Michel labels the "speaking yet muted intelligentsia" (Michel 1965, 115).

Kursbuch's action-driven crusade against passive, art-focused, silent, or system-loyal intellectuals reaches its high point—parallel to the rebellious events in the streets around the world—in 1968. In "Berlin Commonplaces," the last essay of *Kursbuch* #11 (a special issue entitled *Revolution in Latin America*, published in January 1968), Enzensberger attacks the "harmless oppositional intellectuals," the "established writers,

scientists, and publicists," and the "old" intellectuals (i.e. "old social-democrats, neoliberals, and late-Jacobins"), while ultimately exemplifying the "ditches between the 'Old' and 'New' Left" (Niese 2017, 257–8). I will argue below that Enzensberger's essay can be understood as a radicalized progression forward from Michel's "The Mute Intelligence" (*Kursbuch* #1, 1965) and Chomsky's "The Responsibility of Intellectuals" (*Kursbuch* #9, 1967).

In a very Marcusian fashion, Enzensberger begins his article by stating that the FRG is a capitalist state that falsely claims to be democratic.[23] The ruling class would resume its old positions of power through "financial and industrial capitalism, ministerial and legal bureaucracy, church and military infrastructure" (1982 [1968], 142).[24] The Cold War "paralyzed all revolutionary alternatives," monopoly capitalism "pretended to be social-market economy," and mass consumption is sold as "the embodiment of freedom" (ibid., 141–2). And while "German capitalism had to accept the rules of the game of formal democracy," Enzensberger does not doubt that "the ruling class in Germany always regarded the constitution as nothing more than a provisional annoyance" (ibid., 142). The *Kursbuch* founder concludes his introduction with a revolutionary call: "These facts show that the political system of the Federal Republic is no longer repairable. One has either to consent to it or replace it by a new system. A third possibility is not in sight" (ibid., 144).

---

[23] Marcuse argued in 1967 that "in no existing society, and surely not in those which call themselves democratic, does democracy exist. What exists is a kind of very limited, illusory form of democracy that is beset with inequalities, while the true conditions of democracy have still to be created" (Marcuse 1970a [1967], 80).

[24] *Kursbuch* published Enzensberger's essay in German. The English translation is taken from *Critical Essays: Hans Magnus Enzensberger* (New York: Continuum, 1982).

Siding with Michel's attacks on the "mute" intelligentsia and Chomsky's criticism of system-loyal intellectuals, Enzensberger blames the "established writers, scientists, and publicists" who "after twenty years of *Gruppe 47*, manifestos, anthologies, and election booths" all have failed to combat late capitalism in a meaningful manner (ibid.). He continues that the "socialism to which they [leftist intellectuals] adhered remained nebulous if only for lack of detailed knowledge; its sociological education was minimal; its conflict with communism neurotic and obvious" (ibid.). Repeating his argument against Peter Weiss from *Kursbuch* #6 mentioned above, Enzensberger reemphasizes that "[s]olidarity among intellectuals, too, remains pure rhetoric as it does not manifest itself in political actions whose usefulness can be proved" (ibid., 147). Intellectual deliberation and solidarity, in fact, only trigger the passivity that Enzensberger, Michel, and Chomsky want to see overcome. A Marxist theory that critiques society but does not initiate practical change to it, has to be liberated from its passivity:

> Theory sans practice means to adopt a wait-and-see attitude. Any halfway analytically schooled mind is in a position to produce an infinite number of reasons that suggest waiting, that say that it is either too early or too late. If only for that, every theory not covered, corrected, and propelled by actions is worthless. (Ibid., 151)

According to the *Kursbuch* founder, no socialist project so far has been able to create a counter-public sphere capable of challenging late capitalism significantly. Consequently, his criticism also applies to political organizing. Enzensberger asserts that the Western Communist parties would not have offered any revolutionary perspectives either because

they "degenerated Stalinistically; they have no internal democracy and no useful external program" (ibid., 153). To use Lenin's famous words once again: *What is to be done?* According to Enzensberger, the revolutionary goal is to "arouse the deepest wishes and desires of the masses" (ibid., 155). He holds on to the classic Marxist notion that "the dependent masses" are the only revolutionary subjects, not the intellectuals (ibid., 150). But such lack of agency does not mean that intellectuals could not be helpful since "history teaches just as clearly that it is invariably a minority that sets off the revolutionary process" (ibid.).

The problem for Enzensberger, as for Michel and Chomsky, is that intellectuals have not been part of that process due to its detachment from the revolutionary masses:

> The working class observes the utterances of intellectuals with a mistrust that is historically justified. Enlightenment is necessary but insufficient. The mind industry is in firm hands. The dependent classes will only begin to see through their enmeshment and recognize their long-term interests when conditions in the interior of the metropolises come to a head. (Ibid., 147)

Enzensberger argues that because the "Old" Left—sidetracked by art for art's sake and other bourgeois distractions—has failed to initiate revolutionary impulses in the masses. Participating in what can be called retrospectively the revolutionary *zeitgeist* of the late 1960s, Enzensberger calls for a "New Left" that would be finally enable capitalism's overthrow, with all means necessary:

> All political actions now stand and fall in the context of the international revolutionary movement […] It is foreseeable that violence on the international

> scale will increase. Peace is a fiction in the metropolises under the prevailing social conditions. In reality we live in a permanent state of war, and the repercussions on our political situation will become more and more apparent every year. […] Whoever balances his account with huge catastrophes over there and a peaceful life over here, with genocide in foreign reaches and tolerance at home, with blind force to the outside and democratic conditions on the inside—that person is a fool. (Ibid., 146)

"Berlin Commonplaces" is arguably one of Enzensberger's most radical essays published in *Kursbuch*. It not only considers the exploited countries outside the "European Periphery" as sites of struggle, but Enzensberger claims that even living in West Germany means being at war—a rhetoric soon to be used by RAF terrorists. Other publications of that time confirm Enzensberger's radicalization, some of which openly advocate violence as an emancipatory and legitimate defense against a repressive state.[25] The "Old" Left is rejected as politically and intellectually worthless, and what is needed is political and, if necessary, violent action, not just deliberation.

Throughout this section, we have seen that *Kursbuch*'s intellectual public sphere is essentially a politically radicalized and dogmatic version of Habermas' bourgeois public sphere that insists on intellectual action instead of proletarian power. Enzensberger designs

[25] As a member of the *Berliner Redaktionskollektiv*—a group of high-profile left-activists including student leader Rudi Dutschke, Iranian political exile and author Bahman Nirumand, and the authors Michael Schneider, Peter Schneider, Jürgen Horlemann, Gaston Salvatore, and Eckhard Siepmann—Enzensberger rejects nonviolence as repressive while advocating *emancipatory* violence as a contrast to oppressive state violence (*Berliner Redaktionskollektiv* 1968, 26). The collective argues that violence is "an instrument we shall neither categorically reject nor use arbitrarily, one whose effectiveness and revolutionary legitimacy we need to learn to understand in a process of theoretical reflection and practical use" (translated by Colvin 2009, 37).

his journal as a site where intellectuals meet and share their viewpoints. The edited "debates" between Sartre and Simon or Weiss and Enzensberger illustrate such maneuvers. But reading through *Kursbuch*'s first years of publication, it becomes clear that this public sphere is as non-proletarian as the one Habermas envisions. Furthermore, it is dogmatic in the sense that it does not allow actual debates to take place. Opposing opinions, such as Claude Simon's, are being outflanked and merely serve to strengthen the editors' overall agenda. As mentioned above, *Kursbuch* is indeed a carefully edited collage of voices played against each other, intending to support Enzensberger's political visions. Let us remember, Enzensberger wanted an apparatus to seize control of the Consciousness Industry through cultural and societal criticism. He wanted intellectuals to create critical consciousness and reveal power relations and manipulation in society, always in strict reference to contemporaneous social conflicts. His Marxist agenda aimed for an emancipation of intellectuals from what he considered the mere reproduction of the *old*, i.e. "ossified gestures, cadences, and attitudes such those that appear in established genres" (see chapter 2's footnote 4).

Kursbuch's portrayal of "correct" intellectual behavior and engagement with the bourgeois public sphere is thus as evident as it is dogmatic: intellectuals should reject art that is not in line with what I have called Marxist "realism 2.0" (chapter 3), or just art altogether (chapter 4). They should not be passive bystanders (Michel's "The Mute Intelligence") but instead use their position to create a counter-public sphere that unmasks society's injustices (Chomsky's "The Responsibility of Intellectuals"). By doing so, intellectuals should ignite the revolutionary spark that would subsequently set the stage for

sweeping change (Enzensberger's "Berlin Commonplaces"). Of course, none of that happened—the "depended revolutionary masses" and the "revolutionary war in the streets" failed to materialize outside of *Kursbuch*'s bourgeois public sphere. In a 1970 interview with Herbert Marcuse, published in *Kursbuch* #22, Enzensberger would admit retrospectively that the rebellious students and left intellectuals failed to understand and mobilize the working masses beyond their intellectual circles (H. M. Enzensberger and Marcuse 1970, 53).

Returning to Negt and Kluge, we can understand why *Kursbuch*'s intellectual guidance within a bourgeois public sphere had to prove themselves ineffective for proletarian experience: *Kursbuch*'s intellectual disputes only reproduced the experience of the left intelligentsia while excluding that of other spheres. At the end of the day, it was yet another group of Marxist intellectuals reframing the *Realism-Modernism Debate* while calling for a revolution without revolutionaries.

This limitation did not go unnoticed at the time. One of the few West German Marxist voices that predicted even *before* 1968 that "1968" could not happen was *Literaturmagazin* founder Hans Christoph Buch. As documented in chapter 1, Buch understood that the "student revolution" in West Germany was not revolutionary but just a caricature of a revolution (1968 [1967], 133). In his only *Kursbuch* contribution, Buch similarly emphasizes (while attacking the *Kursbuch* editorial team by name) the dialectical need between a bourgeois and proletarian public sphere. Moralizing bourgeois intellectuals outside any proletarian sphere, Buch argues, would be as useless as intellectuals pretending

to be workers inside the proletarian sphere.[26] The *Literaturmagazin* founder depicts the intelligentsia's strength not in igniting Enzensberger's revolutionary spark in the burning streets of the metropolises, but in using the superstructure to advance the capitalist contradictions within the base.[27] Degrading art's social potential as elitist and luxurious nonsense, as seen in *Kursbuch* #15, is for Buch a strategic mistake.[28] For him, the responsibility of an intellectual is not direct political action and top-down theoretical enlightenment, but providing access to art's "utopian promise" and "hope for liberation."[29]

Given Buch's above remarks from 1967 and 1970, it is no surprise that he took *Literaturmagazin* in an entirely different direction than *Kursbuch*—or, to be more precise, set it on a course *against* Enzensberger's magazine. *Literaturmagazin* had several issues whose themes were in explicit contrast to *Kursbuch* and its contemporaries on the New Left. I have already discussed *Literaturmagazin* #1, which examines and criticizes both the established intelligentsia's as well as the New Left's aesthetic approaches to Marxism. I

---

[26] Original German quote: "Wer mit erhobenem Zeigefinger, in der Pose des Aufklärers, von außen ans Proletariat herantritt und ihm Aufschluß über seine Lage verspricht, handelt genauso falsch wie jene verzweifelten Intellektuellen, die sich Arbeiterkleidung anziehen und so ihre soziale Identität verdrängen" (Buch 1970, 48).

[27] Original German quote: "Wer sich dieser Aufgabe verschreibt, wird zwar nicht gleich die Genugtuung haben, mit seinen Gedichten den Generalstreik auszulösen, aber immerhin kann er dazu beitragen, durch seine Arbeit im Überbau, die Entwicklung der Widersprüche an der Basis voranzutreiben. Das ist nicht wenig" (ibid.).

[28] Original German quote: "Die bürgerlichen Intellektuellen vergessen allzu schnell, was sie ihrer Lektüre verdanken. [...] Jene Aufklärung, die übersättigten Intellektuellen nur noch als Luxus erscheint, ist für das Proletariat so nötig wie das tägliche Brot. Die Intellektuellen, die so gern mit ihrer eigenen Ohnmacht kokettieren, erkennen nicht, daß diese Ohnmacht eine von Herrschaftsinteressen erzeugte Phrase ist; das Kapital hat ein leicht zu durchschauendes Interesse daran, sie von den werktätigen Massen fernzuhalten, denn in deren Händen könnten ihre Gedanken zur materiellen Gewalt werden" (ibid., 50).

[29] Orignal German quote: "Anstatt mit ihrem schlechten Gewissen hausieren zu gehen, sollten die Intellektuellen die Aufgabe übernehmen, das utopische Versprechen, das in den großen Kunstwerken verschüttet liegt: die Hoffnung auf Befreiung – ganz zu schweigen von der Bereicherung der Phantasie, die sie vermitteln –, freizulegen, um es den Massen zugänglich zu machen" (ibid., 51).

have also shown how Buch attempts in *Literaturmagazin* #2 to situate bourgeois art in its own socio-historical context and how to utilize it for contemporaneous political purposes. His starting point here was that not only the established intelligentsia but also the New Left have failed to produce a deliberate Marxist analysis of bourgeois intellectualism—a reasoning we did encounter earlier when discussing Walter Benjamin's argument that it would be useless to approach art solely by assuming its immediate value for the proletarian class struggle (see chapter 4). Taken together, the early years of *Literaturmagazin* were as much a critical analysis of established intellectual elitism as it was for self-proclaimed New Left revolutionaries.

In the next section, I will set Buch's editorial work in *Literaturmagazin* further into dialogue with *Kursbuch* to illustrate their different approaches to the intelligentsia's social role in creating a counter-public sphere. To render this vast question feasible, I will focus my attention on *Literaturmagazin* #4, entitled "Die Literatur nach dem Tod der Literatur: Bilanz der Politisierung" [The Literature after the Death of Literature: Results of the Politicization] (1975). We can see that the journal's fourth issue is already in its title a direct response to the *Death of Literature* thesis associated with *Kursbuch* #15 (1968).

LITERATURMAGAZIN: DO NOT REINVENT MARXISM; UNDERSTAND IT!

I have shown above that *Kursbuch*'s first publication years set a clear guideline of what the magazine thought New Left intellectuals ought to be doing to create a Marxist counter-public sphere: they should be engaged actors advocating an anti-capitalist revolutionary agenda, uncovering repressive ideologies, denouncing perceived

counterrevolutionary intellectuals, rejecting the bourgeoisie's artistic estrangements, all while enlightening the masses and preparing them for the inevitable revolution. Simultaneously, *Kursbuch* also made clear what intellectuals should not be doing: wasting energy in counterrevolutionary bourgeois art forms, practicing abstract and non-action driven theoretical deliberation, or engaging and cooperating with a repressive state apparatus. At this point in my work, it should come as no surprise that *Literaturmagazin* went into the complete opposite direction, as I will examine below in selected contributions from *Literaturmagazin* #4 (1975)—a condemnation of Enzensberger and *Kursbuch*.

Literaturmagazin editor Buch begins his magazine's fourth issue, published in 1975 and thus a decade after the first *Kursbuch*, with an excerpt from Ernst Bloch's essay "Marxism and Poetry" (1935). As I have discussed in chapter 3, Bloch's work emphasized the need to combine utopianism and Marxism to ensure the latter's dialectical core principles. Bloch's essay, placed at the beginning of *Literaturmagazin* #4, stresses Buch's dialectical and critical approach to Marxism. One part of the Bloch passage states:

> Nowadays a dream has a hard time in the world outside. That is the lament particularly of those writers whose inner life is not in mere disarray. They distrust sheer private humbug, and they have the will to express their common truth. They are thus led to socialist thought, which alone provides them with direction. But many writers touched by Marxism tend to consider themselves handicapped by this cold touch. The inner life does not come out well this way: the feeling and careful desire to articulate it are not always noticed. Each flower figures as a lie, and the intellect appears dried out or, if it has any juice at all, it is acidic. Many a pen

> becomes helpless by writing fiction while wanting to write the truth. (1988 [1935], 156)[30]

Putting Bloch's words in the context of "1968," it becomes an indictment of the "documentary turn" and *Kursbuch*'s rejection of what its editors considered socially purposeless bourgeois and non-fictional art. Connecting the argument with the 1930s, i.e. when Bloch's wrote the essay, it is once again evident how the *Realism-Modernism Debate* hauls its aesthetic controversies both into and way beyond "1968," even though Enzensberger and *Kursbuch* #15 declared victory to Marxist "realism 2.0."

Bloch's 1935 essay further addresses those intellectuals who after the "failed" revolution of 1968 turned their back on Marxism. He states: "Those who are handicapped say that Marx stole their good conscience of invention. It is amazing how much Marx is blamed for everything. But even a good story often no longer knows where to begin" (ibid.). In a time where disappointed intellectuals averted their heads away from Marxism (as seen in Peter Schneider's *Lenz* [1973]), Buch's *Bloch appropriation* makes an important point: it was not Marxist theory that let the 1968ers down—the 1968ers did not grasp Marxist theory. In an almost prophetic fashion, the excerpt ends with Bloch's call for intellectuals to utilize the utopian function of art rather than getting lost in fetishized realism(s):

> The time will come when the art of writing a story is no longer suspicious and when a mind with ideas will almost be busy not to have any; when having imagination is no longer a crime or treated largely as idealistic, as if there were no subjective factor

[30] *Literaturmagazin* published Bloch's essay in German. The English translation is taken from *The Utopian Function of Art and Literature: Selected Essays* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988).

> at all; when the surface of things no longer stands for their totality, their cliché no longer for their reality […] The long lasting praise of a realism, castrated by classicistic formulas, as the only genuine one is, from a Marxist point of view, an anomaly, both narrow-minded and dilettantish. But if one chooses to accept Marxism, then it opens gates to poetry where the bleakness, solitude, and disorientation of late capitalism are pressing concerns. (Ibid., 158)

In the context of the aesthetic debates around "1968," Bloch serves as a call to overcome the *Death of Literature* thesis advocated by *Kursbuch*. *Literaturmagazin* editor Buch uses the 1935 essay to criticize the New Left's approaches to Marxism. In going back to yet another pre-1945 discussion of Marxist aesthetics, Buch highlights once more that Marxism does not have to be dogmatized, radicalized, rejuvenated, or internationalized, as *Kursbuch* attempted to do. By showing the shocking relevance and warnings of a 1935 essay by Bloch, Buch reminds his readers that Marxism must not be reinvented, but understood in its critical, dialectical, and utopian dimensions.

After starting the journal off with Bloch, Buch introduces *Literaturmagazin* #4 with his own "Vorbericht" [Preliminary Report], in which he diagnoses both a de-politicization of the public sphere and the impossibility of a politically relevant literary counter-public sphere as a result of "1968."[31] Let us remember that Buch sees the intellectual's responsibility in using their position in the superstructure to advance the capitalist

[31] Original German quote: "Ich weiß nicht, ob die genannten Fälle ausreichen, ein politisches Klima zu beschreiben, in dem die Schriftsteller – und mit ihnen die Literatur – vom Ersticken bedroht sind, wenn sie nicht den Bezug zur politischen Wirklichkeit aufgeben und damit auch ästhetisch wirkungslos werden wollen: das eine ist ohne das andere nicht zu haben. Die Frage, wie die Literatur unter diesen Umständen überleben kann, läßt sich nur beantworten, wenn man sie zurückverfolgt zu den Ursprüngen der Politisierung 1967/68. Was uns heute bewegt, wurde damals zum erstenmal formuliert" (Buch 1975, 12).

contradictions within the base (1970, 48). The rebellious New Left actors of "1968," the *Literaturmagazin* editor argues, failed to do precisely that.

Buch blames Enzensberger directly for contributing to an intellectual climate in which theoretical critiques of literature became more important than literature itself.[32] He states: "Es geht, wieder einmal, um den Realismus" ["It is once again about realism"] (1975, 14). However, Buch argues that unlike the disputes about realism in the 1930s (see chapter 3), *Kursbuch* and its 1968 New Left contemporaries would have only appropriated the *Realism-Modernism Debate* for narcissistic purposes without engaging with the Marxist significance surrounding questions of realism, not to speak of actual political praxis.[33] Put differently, instead of examining Marxist aesthetics and their relevance for a proletarian public sphere critically, Enzensberger and other intellectuals would have decided to engage in a one-sided debate for self-stating purposes. For Buch, the fact that, shortly after "1968," Enzensberger was back at writing poetry, symbolizes the empty insincerity and shallowness of the New Left's disputes on realism (ibid., 13). Buch condemns New Left intellectuals for not practicing critical thinking but instead appropriating Marxism for their own gains, all while entirely failing (or even attempting) to understand the significance of debating realism within Marxist aesthetics—an argument

[32] Original German quote: "Auf die Todeserklärung für die Literatur, von Enzensberger ohnehin nur als poetische Metapher gemeint, folgte zwar keine Blüte, aber doch eine Schwemme sozialkritischer Literatur; Enzensberger selbst war nach kurzer Zeit wieder beim Gedichteschreiben angelangt. [...] [P]lötzlich [waren] theoretische Abhandlungen über Literatur mehr gefragt als die Sache, von der sie zu handeln vorgeben: an die Stelle der primären trat die Sekundärliteratur" (ibid., 13).

[33] Original German quote: "Fragen, die schon zu ihrer Entstehungszeit nur einen kleinen Kreis von Spezialisten bewegt hatten – Brecht oder Lukács? Bürgerliche oder proletarische Literatur? Tendenz oder Parteilichkeit? – wurden neu aufgelegt und so lange aufgebläht, bis der theoretische Wasserkopf die praktische Arbeit buchstäblich erdrückt hatte" (ibid.).

Sepp (2019) will make over four decades later in his remarks on the 1960s *Marx appropriation* (see chapter 3). Going back to the overriding concern of this chapter, Buch's criticism points rightfully once again to the limitations of being exclusively within the Habermasian bourgeois public sphere.

Buch furthermore reminds his readers that abuses of theory are nothing new or specific to "1968." As I have shown above, *Literaturmagazin* #4 begins with Bloch's warning against the "long lasting praise of a realism, castrated by classicistic formulas" (Bloch 1988 [1935], 158). A second pre-1945 voice that Buch cites to critique Enzensberger and his acquaintances is German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900). He quotes the following passage from *The Gay Science* (1882) to further highlight dogmatic realism's limitations and its appropriations by 1960s New Left intellectuals:

> *To the realists.*— You sober people who feel well armed against passion and fantasies and would like to turn your emptiness into a matter of pride and an ornament: you call yourselves realists and hint that the world really is the way it appears to you. As if reality stood unveiled before you only, and you yourselves were perhaps the best part of it—O you beloved images of Sais! (1974 [1887], 121)[34]

The Bloch and Nietzsche quotations again support Buch's argument that intellectuals who claim to have discovered reality and build their political strategy from within their confined bourgeois public sphere of realism fail their ultimate duty as Marxist intellectuals:

[34] *Literaturmagazin* published Nietzsche's quote in German. The English translation is taken from *The Gay Science* (New York: Vintage Books, 1974). The reference "you beloved images of Sais" refers to Friedrich Schiller's (1759–1805) ballad *The Veiled Image at Sais* (1795).

contributing to a Marxist framework in the superstructure in order further anti-capitalist struggles in other base-centered domains, such as the proletarian public sphere. Buch's assertion that "1968" was a counterrevolutionary caricature of an upheaval (1968 [1967], 133) seems to apply to the New Left's appropriation of the *Realism-Modernism Debate*: whereas in both cases, estranged intellectuals were involved within the bourgeois public sphere, the original 1930s dispute was for Buch an enthusiastic and sincere debate, whereas *Kursbuch* and company only staged a discussion without any Marxist significance.

The reckoning with the self-declared revolutionary intelligentsia of "1968" continues throughout *Literaturmagazin* #4. Reinhard Lettau's (1929–96) essay "Eitle Überlegungen zur literarischen Situation" [Vain Deliberations on the Literary Situation] attacks both the literary theory and praxis of "1968." Lettau directs his criticism to Enzensberger and other "market-dominating" authors such as Jürgen Becker (1932–), Peter O. Chotjewitz (1934–2010), Günter Grass (1927–2015), Peter Handke (1942–), Gaston Salvatore (1941–2015), and Peter Schneider (1940–), as well as the aesthetic theoreticians Peter Bürger (1936–2017), Christian Enzensberger (1931–2009), Helga Gallas (1940–), Jürgen Habermas (1929–), and Rudolf zur Lippe (1937–).

Lettau's essay is dedicated to "H.M."—presumably Herbert Marcuse, who was Lettau's former colleague at the University of California, San Diego. It is therefore no surprise that Lettau positions himself in line with his former colleague's argument (published slightly after *Literaturmagazin* #4) that the "political potential of art [lies] in art itself" (Marcuse 1978 [1977], ix; see chapter 3). Lettau evaluates attempts on the contrary (as found in *Kursbuch*) advocating politicized and revolutionary literature as opportunistic.

In contrast to such unanimous yet dogmatic promotions of a Marxist "realism 2.0," Lettau understands literature's revolutionary praxis and simultaneously the intellectual's responsibility dialectically: radicality, he argues, lies in strengthening the revolutionary process by questioning it and pointing to potential shortcomings, not affirming it blindly.[35]

Literaturmagazin's crusade against 1968's intelligentsia continues with German writer Hermann Peter Piwitt's (1935–) contribution "Rückblick auf heiße Tage: Die Studentenrevolte in der Literatur" [Throwback to Hot Days: The Student Rebellion in Literature]. Piwitt begins his essay with an attack on *Kursbuch* #15, especially its article "A Wreath for Literature" written by the journal's co-editor Karl Markus Michel (see chapter 4). Piwitt's essay points out that those intellectuals who spend their entire previous professional existences dealing with art suspiciously felt the pressure to denounce art around 1968.[36] This remark on intellectual performativity resembles Buch's assertions that Enzensberger, Michel, and company were not concerned about having intellectuals debates on the complexities of Marxist aesthetics, but rather engaged in a debate about themselves as intellectuals. Piwitt argues that the intelligentsia of "1968" was just interested in closing a market gap through a staged self-presentation without concerns for actual political

[35] Original German quote: "Es ist nicht gerade radikal, sondern eher sogar opportunistisch, die Literatur aufzufassen als einen Briefträger der Revolution. Vielmehr müßte die Literatur radikal genug sein, ohne Plan und Spekulation, mit ihren ganz eigenen Mitteln, der Revolution jene Fragen vorzulegen, die sie vielleicht nie lösen kann, deren Sticheleien sie hoffentlich unsicher machen, also stärken, d. h., die Literatur hat gegenüber der Revolution die Verpflichtung der Subversion, wobei die radikale revolutionäre Praxis des Schriftstellers die ebenso radikale, jeden Sklavendienst ablehnende ästhetische Praxis des Schriftstellers nicht ausschließt, sondern ergänzt" (Lettau 1975, 21).

[36] Original German quote: "Anderen fiel damals schon auf, daß vor allem angehende Geisteswissenschaftler, Germanisten, Graphiker, Schauspieler, also Leute, die bisher rund um die Uhr mit Kunst befaßt waren, am gereiztesten auf alles reagierten, was mit Kunst zu tun hatte" (Piwitt 1975, 35).

action.[37] Characterized by their "individualism, impatience, hubris, and peculiar aestheticism of violence," Piwitt asserts, the New Left participated in political proxy efforts without political benefit.[38]

Literaturmagazin #4's arguably most direct contempt for Enzensberger and *Kursbuch* is shown in an essay by German author Christian Linder (1949–), entitled "Der lange Sommer der Romantik: Über Hans Magnus Enzensberger" [The Long Summer of Romanticism: On Hans Magnus Enzensberger]. Linder argues that, against common assumptions, Enzensberger would not be an *engaged* but a *romantic* intellectual with questionable Marxist intentions. For romantic intellectuals, reality would be nothing but an "infinite space for play, self-realization, contradictions, [and] imagination"—they like getting involved without being committed, which would make any Marxist agenda implausible.[39] It is therefore impossible to say where Enzensberger's political and literary position or agenda lies, because his public persona would be nothing but a narcissistic self-

[37] Original German quote: "In Polit-Happenings, nach deren politischen Effekt nicht mehr gefragt wurde; Hauptsache, sie waren in sich gelungen. In Selbstinszenierungen einzelner, die, die einmalige Marktlücke nutzend, schließlich und endlich sich selbst als Kunstwerke ausstellten" (ibid., 36).

[38] Original German quote: "In Westdeutschland [...] schwärmten die Kellergeister des bürgerlichen Unbewußten mit der Geisterwelt des Überbaus gleichsam ungebunden um die Wette: Individualismus, Ungeduld, Selbstüberschätzung und ein besonderer Ästhetizismus der Gewalt suchten ihren Ausdruck schließlich in Aktionen, die [...] nur noch 'selig in sich selbst schienen', ohne daß einer der Beteiligten nach ihrem politischen Nutzen noch vernünftig gefragt hätte" (ibid.).

[39] Original German quote: "Für den romantischen Intellektuellen ist die Wirklichkeit unendlicher Raum für Spiel, Selbstverwirklichung, für Gegensätze, für Phantasie, es ist ein flüchtiger, Subjektivierung ermöglichender Raum. Während der klassische Typus alles Zufällige beiseite schiebt, betont der Romantiker – und auch Enzensberger tut es – das Zufällige, das Besondere, er hebt die Variante hervor; insofern ist Enzensberger im strengen Sinne auch kein Marxist. [...] Er ist ein Mensch, der sich immer irgendwo einmischt und sich dann aber wieder herauszieht und sich fein macht für was Neues. Es ist die typisch romantische Aktivität" (Linder 1975, 92).

staging.[40] As an example of such claims, Linder points to deliberate omissions in Enzensberger's published curriculum vitae to highlight how the *Kursbuch* editor constructs a public identity that is at odds with the engagement expected of an intellectual (e.g. omitting a fellowship position in "capitalist" Australia while instead claiming to have been in "socialist" Cuba during that specific time period).[41]

By looking into the *Kursbuch* founder's publication history around "1968," Linder shares Buch's accusations mentioned above concerning Enzensberger's political insincerity, especially in respect to the claims made in *Kursbuch* #15's anti-literary agenda. Shortly after declaring bourgeois literature a socially purposeless in 1968, Enzensberger had been back at publishing poetry, as I have noted above.[42] According to Linder, this inconsistency would highlight Enzensberger's valuation of his public persona over any actual political praxis.[43] *Kursbuch* itself, Linder argues, would be nothing but Enzensberger's self-dramatization stage.[44] The magazine's provocative stances would be

---

[40] Original German quote: "In allem, was er [Enzensberger] in seinem Leben und Schreiben gemacht hat, ist er ungehemmt in der Selbstinszenierung, sein Narzißmus ist ungekränkt" (ibid., 85–6).

[41] Original German quote: "Denn Enzensberger ging anschließend nicht sofort nach Cuba, sondern nach Australien, dort hatte man ihm auch ein Stipendium angeboten, das er erst einmal wahrnahm; erst einige Zeit später reiste er nach Cuba und reiste dann auch bald wieder ab. Was sich hier wieder einmal zeigte: er weiß immer ganz genau, wann er was sagt, Wirkungen schätzt er vorher ein" (ibid., 90–1).

[42] Melin (2003) recovers a much more active political program in Enzensberger's poetry and thus counters Buch and Linder's assertations. Regrettably, her remarks are beyond the scope of the current study.

[43] Original German quote: "Er veröffentlicht also immer abwechselnd Literatur und politische Arbeiten und hält sich streng an diese Abwechslung [...] Beide Arbeiten ergänzen sich auch nicht, sie stehen vielmehr konträr zueinander. Das geht so weit, daß er wie gesagt 1968 in die Todeserklärung für die Schöne bürgerliche Literatur einstimmte, und nicht ganz zwei Jahre später nahm er die Erklärung wieder ein wenig zurück, weil er nämlich dann wieder einen Gedichtband veröffentlichte" (Linder 1975, 91).

[44] Original German quote: "Enzensberger ist ein Spieler, und zwar einer, der auch und vor allem auf äußeren Glanz achtet. Ein Artist. Seine Attacken im '*Kursbuch*' – wirklich glänzende Inszenierungen" (ibid., 100).

consequently self-serving, not political.[45] Ultimately, Enzensberger's political contributions would be meaningless because they are not intended to be political.[46]

My selected remarks on *Literaturmagazin* #4 have shown that its contributors are again orchestrated collectively to make the case that the intelligentsia of the late 1960s has failed—for mostly self-serving reasons—to leave (or acknowledge their existence within) the bourgeois public sphere. The last contribution that I will point out for this subchapter can be understood as *Literaturmagazin*'s attempt to build a bridge to the proletarian public sphere, or, at least, to point out the need to do so. In conversation with German publisher Heinz Ludwig Arnold (1940–2011), German writer Günter Wallraff (1942–) emphasizes the need for intellectuals to target those "who have not been reached," i.e. the workers.[47] Although Wallraff does consider Marxism as his main ideological influence, he states that intellectuals should avoid being entirely devoted to ideologies, because such commitments would only result in "variations and interpretations" of a respective doctrine.[48] Explicit Marxist ideology, he argues, would only discourage worker's participation in literary and

---

[45] Original German quote: "Ein Typus wie Enzensberger, der auf Reaktionen der Öffentlichkeit angewiesen ist und deshalb diese Reaktionen immer wieder hervorreizen muß, hat natürlich Probleme mit der Öffentlichkeit, etwa was ihre Definition betrifft" (ibid., 102).

[46] Original German quote: "Was immer er an Fortschritt formuliert, tut er lediglich intellektuell, ohne sich um die konkrete Praxis zu kümmern. Die Trennung zwischen Leben und Literatur besteht in seinen Arbeiten fort; er ist nie operativ geworden mit dem, was er sagt und meint. Das ist alles gut geschrieben und beschrieben, aber dann läßt er alles gesagt sein, engagiert sich also nicht für die Interessen, sondern nimmt das nächste Flugzeug in den nächsten Urwald, zieht sich also aus einer Sache heraus, landet irgendwo und mischt sich dort wieder in eine andere Sache ein" (ibid., 104).

[47] Original German quote: "Meine Zielgruppe war von Anfang an und ist immer mehr die Schicht, die bisher von der Literatur nicht erreicht wurde, also alle, die draußen waren, die nicht gelesen haben" (Arnold and Wallraff 1975, 54).

[48] Original German quote: "Ich versuche bis heute, mich nicht einer Ideologie zu verschreiben, weil ich dann nur noch Abwandlungen und Übersetzungen zu einer jeweiligen Ideologie liefere. Ich glaube, für einen Autor ist es auch wichtig, sich jenseits einer Ideologie immer wieder neu der Wirklichkeit zu stellen und auszusetzen" (ibid., 49).

political involvements.[49] Taking the example of a writer, an intellectual should thus write *for* the working people and thematize their lifeworld.[50] Furthermore, the intellectual should function as an enabler for workers to articulate their own voices and express their own experiences—to use Negt and Kluge's words: enable the "autonomous, collective organization of the experiences specific to workers" (1993 [1972], 28).[51]

Whether or not Wallraff's work and *Literaturmagazin*'s attempts to build a bridge between the bourgeois and the proletarian public sphere can be considered successful has to be subject of a different discussion. What I want to point out is the similarity of Buch's critique of *Kursbuch* in *Literaturmagazin* to Negt and Kluge's theoretical critique of Habermas. As Negt and Kluge point out, Habermas' bourgeois public sphere is not intended to be accessible to everyone, nor is it a democratic space for equal discussion. It is at its core a channel for self-staging bourgeois intellectuals serving their own interests while pretending to strive for democratic values. The same arguments can be found in *Literaturmagazin*'s condemnation of *Kursbuch*'s approach to Marxism. Behind the veil of having a *realist* political agenda seems to be nothing but bourgeois intellectuals using the magazine's "Marxist platform" for self-staging purposes. Interestingly, *Literaturmagazin*'s

---

[49] Original German quote: "Und es hat auch diejenigen erreicht, die keine Ideologie hatten, die sogar ideologiefeindlich waren und die, wenn man ihnen mit marxistischer Ideologie gekommen wäre, verschreckt worden wären" (ibid., 48).

[50] Original German quote: "Er [Schriftsteller] sollte versuchen, sich in den Dienst von unterdrückten Mehrheiten, von Schichten zu stellen, die sonst nicht zu Wort kommen, die sonst nicht repräsentiert sind" (ibid., 56).

[51] Original German quote: "Das Normale wäre aber, daß die, die in diesen Schichten und den ihnen zugeordneten Arbeitsbereichen stecken, auch schreiben, daß sie ermutigt werden – und das versuchen die Werkstätten auf vielen Umwegen zu erreichen. [...] Einem Arbeiter im Betrieb, der nie gefragt wird, der nie Entscheidungen mitbestimmt, über den nur verfügt wird, über den hinwegbestimmt wird, kommt irgendwann die Sprache abhanden. Reden hat Sinn doch nur, wenn Reden etwas zu erreichen vermag, wenn er also ein Gegenüber hat und Gehör findet" (ibid., 52).

accusations against Enzensberger and *Kursbuch* have not met any attention in the myriad of public or scholarly examinations of West Germany's leading Marxist magazine around "1968." Whether or not this gap has to do with Enzensberger's self-marketing skills, has to be subject to a different discussion as well.

INTELLECTUALS OR WORKERS? YES, PLEASE!

"In a well-known Marx Brothers joke[,] Groucho answers the standard question 'Tea or coffee?' with 'Yes, please!' – a refusal of choice" (Žižek 2000, 90). In this chapter, I have looked at how *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* dealt with the (arguably false) alternative between intellectual responsibility and proletarian class struggle and their significance for creating an anti-capitalist counter-public sphere. What has become once again undisputable is that *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* represent a multilayered set of Marxist interpretations around 1968, full of theoretical tensions about how to generate a public space for progressive leftism.

Similar to its one-sided discussions about the social function of literature that I identified in chapter 4, *Kursbuch* around "1968" is also pushing a set of dogmatic expectations about how to act as an intellectual. According to the magazine's directive, the intellectual has to be a guiding force, mediating Marxist theory to inflame the revolutionary masses. All deliberations that were not immediate or directly related to this process ought to be rejected. Typical for *Kursbuch*, these programmatic principles were situated in contemporaneous, international, and Marxist engagements, all thus from within the limitations of a bourgeois public sphere: the magazine was essentially a platform for

intellectual to convey appropriate Marxist positions within the public sphere which the journal provided. Ironically, *Kursbuch* embraced this kind of bourgeois intellectualism detached from any attempts to act within a proletarian public sphere, while it at the same time denounced bourgeois cultural productions (e.g. bourgeois literature; see chapter 4).

These contradictions are pointed out in *Literaturmagazin*. Editor Buch and other contributors condemned Enzensberger's journal for its dogmatic and narrow approach to the intellectual's responsibilities. Similar to Negt and Kluge's critique of the bourgeois public sphere, the deliberations found in *Literaturmagazin* argue that *Kursbuch*'s exclusive and normative assertions about appropriate aesthetics appear to be precisely the bourgeois characteristics Enzensberger and others pretended to combat. As with questions surrounding literature, editor Buch deliberately references pre-1945 Marxist approaches (rather than contemporaneous theory) to question the arguments found in *Kursbuch*.

We again see that although both Buch and Enzensberger situate their political ideology in Marxism, they represent two entirely different Marxisms in terms of their approaches and representatives.

On the one side, *Kursbuch* rejects and discredits art forms that do not match its aesthetic guidelines. Enzensberger's journal advocates an action-driven agenda led by intellectuals and assumes that the FRG's literary establishment and its critics consist of former Nazis, are an elitist bourgeois circle detached from social reality, and participate in a reactionary aesthetic practice which only benefits capitalist exploitation and which thus is incapable of mobilizing revolutionary masses. The magazine's portrayal of an engaged (yet ultimately bourgeois) intellectual is in line with such arguments.

Literaturmagazin, in contrast, values utopianism and fiction as part of a broader-based anti-capitalist consciousness-raising process, which is intended not only to engage bourgeois intellectuals but actually infiltrates the project of a proletarian public sphere as envisioned by Negt and Kluge. *Literaturmagazin* thus acknowledges the need to go beyond the limitations of the bourgeois public sphere and its engaged protagonists while accusing *Kursbuch* of the opposite. Nonetheless, we should question *Literaturmagazin*'s portrayal of Enzensberger as an engaged and art rejecting yet self-serving hypocrite jumping back and forth between writing poetry and throwing Molotov cocktails.

Arguably, Enzensberger's editorial work for *Kursbuch* was just a different answer to the same question posed by *Literaturmagazin*: how to bring the intellectual public sphere in line with the proletarian public sphere without all public space being proletarianized? Enzensberger's intellectual association with Sartre resulted in a political engagement that required engaged genres, as illustrated in *Kursbuch*. *Literaturmagazin*'s critique of *Kursbuch* also is a reflection of Buch's opinion and his fondness for pre-1945 aesthetics, not necessarily an objective assessment of *Kursbuch*'s probable success or failure. Similar to their opposing positions on the social functions of literature outlined in chapter 4, their assessment on how to interact as an intellectual within the public sphere again reveals itself as a continuation of Marxist debates that began before and lasted beyond "1968."

My comparisons of the two journals have here again shown their use of very similar publication strategies to very different political ends that generally conform with each other, but which ultimately vary greatly. Given the ongoing and irresolvable nature of debates surrounding Marxist aesthetics and the role of Marxist intellectuals, I want to stress

once again that it is not my intention to determine who has the "better" arguments in their approach to Marxism. Following the dialectical method, the valuable insight of Marxism lies in its contradictions. If we take Marxism seriously, questions surrounding seeming oppositions of intellectuals vs. workers, modernism vs. realism, *Kursbuch* vs. *Literaturmagazin* thus should be answered with: "Yes, please!" In my conclusion, I will return to the intellectual and historical contexts outlined in chapter 1 to 3, in order to return to the larger questions with which I began this comparative study of two great Marxist interventions around "1968."

Conclusion: The Multidimensional Simultaneity of "1968"

This project started with an exercise in locating two signal moments in the Marxisms of the Federal Republic of Germany. From this perspective, I sought to show how *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* represent respectively a public debate that helped trigger "1968" and a reaction to the international student movement in the early 1970s. My results confirm my first claim: both were two different but absolutely central moments in the evolving cultural and intellectual debates of the West German and international Left. Because of how they attempted to respond to and possibly even shape the events of their moment, they represent two central points on the map of what being Marxist meant to various groups of FRG Marxists operating on the evolving landscape of postwar politics as it transitioned beyond the "rubble" generation and the Adenauer era. How these two magazines represented that transition both documents and problematizes the West German Left's positions not only as reactions to that present, but also as outgrowths of indigenous German Marxist traditions that had existed since the start of organized labor movements in the German territories in the nineteenth century.

Chapter 1 illustrated how Buch's and Enzensberger's intellectual biographies and their literary magazines make them appropriate stand-ins for a disputed and complex intellectual landscape in the FRG of their days. *Kursbuch* grew out of an anti-communist, pro-capitalist, pro-Western, and pro-military West German political climate. As a leftist reacting to this atmosphere, Enzensberger wanted his periodical to be an apparatus where intellectuals could formulate the necessary cultural and societal criticism in order to overcome what he perceives as Consciousness Industry through a "dialectic of adjustment and subversion" (Marmulla 2013, 20).

In contrast, *Literaturmagazin* and its founder Buch were from its beginning suspicious of such ambitions and the rebellious movements associated with the *long '68*. This doubt was grounded mainly in aesthetic arguments: Buch identified a lack of Marxist theoretical knowledge and a tendency towards empty actionism among his Marxist contemporaries. Therefore, his magazine was designed as a fierce instrument of critique towards Enzensberger, *Kursbuch*, and the New Left in general. *Literaturmagazin* was ultimately a response to its political climate, the "failed" rebellion, and New Left Marxists—a counterweight to the self-congratulation of the "'68ers."

Chapter 2 and 3's contributions historicized the (at least) two different approaches to Marxism represented in both magazines. My analyses there argued that understanding the journals' efforts for political consciousness-raising has to be situated in a discussion of their underlying ideologies, namely their differing approaches to the Marxist aesthetics that they had inherited and still found viable as responses to the West German situation, especially the hallmark intellectual debates of the early twentieth century. The magazines'

two differing paths also represent new chapters in (again, at least) two different ongoing debates related to international and German Marxisms alike: one the one hand, a traditional Marxist oppositionality, implementing dialectics within more or less realist points of view (*Kursbuch*), as opposed to a strategy aiming at a radical transformation of the site and nature of cultural production and of consciousness through consuming newly designed projects (*Literaturmagazin*). The former is most often met within political Marxist movements; the latter will be more familiar from the debates of French Post-Structuralism at the same time.

Enzensberger's Marxist critique was described in much the terms associated with traditional revolution: he intended his writers to seize control of the Consciousness Industry through cultural and societal criticism. In his account, engaged intellectuals ought to create critical consciousness and reveal power relations and manipulation in society by applying literary praxis and international social theory to expose and illuminate contemporaneous problems for his readers. By contrast, Buch did not believe that the engaged intellectual's job was to lead their followers into particular rethinkings of contemporary problems. Instead, engaged authors were supposed to use what he identified as the productive force needed for a deeper, more transformative Marxist agenda to emerge in society: art. Not ideological leadership, but utopian literature, or compelling images about how capitalism abused society rather than theoretical analysis, would emancipate readers' consciousness so that the base would itself come to realize the necessity of fundamental historical change—so the consumers themselves formulated and, hopefully, embraced new programs of thought and action.

This differentiation between the Marxist critical strategies is not simply convenient. I found documentation for these programs very clearly outlined in the paratextual materials from the founding eras of the two journals. The magazines' calls for submissions, their editors' communications with each other and their publishers, and documentation of discussions within the magazines' editorial boards illustrate how these two periodicals worked out two programs, both consistent with inherited Marxist thought, yet utterly different in execution. Their work, as I have shown, took these shapes primarily because of their different preferences about inherited theories of Marxist aesthetics. Both wished to decolonize the FRG public sphere from the capitalism that had helped spur Germany's Nazi-era into being and to transform that public sphere into a decisively post-fascist Germany by confronting the political and social continuities of the FRG and its "unconquered" Nazi past, still present every day throughout official state political circles. How they hoped to do that differed radically: political critique that clearly explained legacy political issues, or visionary revisionism through art that sponsored new patters of thought—both strategies that had been employed in the 1920s and even earlier.

In chapters 4 and 5, I subsequently analyzed how both magazines implemented their public consciousness-raising programs differently. The keys to these differences were found by focusing on two different themes that figured centrally in defining how their social-political critique was to proceed: the social functions of literature and that of public intellectuals.

Chapter 4 concluded that *Kursbuch* embraced a fondness for documentary texts representing what I have called Marxist "realism 2.0," eventually ending up being

antagonistic to poetic and fictional texts in favor of realistic representations of states of affairs. By 1970, Enzensberger even suggested that written genres were actually counterproductive for socialist causes, and that Marxists should instead focus on entirely new media outlets. Taking this suggestion back to the contexts I established in chapters 1 and 2, it becomes evident that the journal's aesthetic radicalization proceeded hand in hand with the political radicalization around "1968." At the end of its first five years of publishing history, *Kursbuch* came to symbolize a dogmatism in favor of direct political engagement rather than in consciousness-raising alone—a choice grounded in earlier aesthetic disputes (e.g. *Realism-Modernism Debate*), which I outlined in chapter 3. The journal thus followed an agenda driven by the need for direct engagement and action: it assumed that the FRG's literary establishment and its critics consisted of former Nazis, that they were an elitist bourgeois circle detached from social reality (a charge particularly aimed at *Group 47*), and that they participated in a reactionary craft which only benefits capitalist exploitation and which thus was incapable of mobilizing revolutionary masses. Because of that complete colonization of the literary media by such reactionary forces, then, Enzensberger moved to advocate direct political action in a move toward documentary voices.

Unlike *Kursbuch*, Buch's *Literaturmagazin* avoided such a partisan stance in the *Realism-Modernism Debate* by emphasizing the need for critical dialectical thinking, rather than by specifying enemies that needed to be combatted directly. For his program, Buch chose not to engage in a particular political program (like Enzensberger's anti-reactionary agenda, aimed at specific points in the "business of literature"

[*Literaturbetrieb*] of the postwar FRG). Instead, Buch sought to model how literature and literary criticism would have to be engaged with itself and the conditions under which literature and critique were produced and disseminated, rather than just being politically engaged using those established channels—one dare not abandon the need for providing vision and the self-transformation of the arts, in addition to using their inherited form for politics. Buch thus believed that utopian fiction would be equally crucial for a transformation of consciousness as pure theoretical deliberation could be. In his view, fictions and critique conditioned each other dialectically, and hence including transformative and utopian literature would open the field of politics to the insights of new voices and visions. *Literaturmagazin* stressed that altering the readers' consciousness has to be achieved by overcoming normative claims such as *Kursbuch*'s about how political engagement must proceed in literature: more plural dialectical criticism and utopian art would highlight programs for possible futures as opposed to rectification of the past.

After staking out this differentiation between the two editors' and journals' programs, I used chapter 5 to juxtapose how both periodicals evaluated the intellectual's role in a bourgeois public sphere. Not surprisingly, this move revealed once again the tensions between the two magazines under investigation while illustrating conflicting viewpoints within the journals.

Kursbuch, on the one side, was pushing normative guidelines on how to act as an intellectual. Here again, the outline and implications of why Enzensberger intended to start *Kursbuch* (examined in chapters 1 and 2) become evident: like the magazine itself, the intellectual has to be a guiding mediator using Marxist theory to inflame the revolutionary

masses and seize the Consciousness Industry. All intellectual deliberations not immediately or directly related to this process ought to be rejected. Within what for Enzensberger were the clear restrictions of the bourgeois public sphere, the magazine thus essentially became a platform for intellectuals to express and amplify their Marxist positions in a public sphere which the journal provided—a collection of analyses of real events and situations, conducted in more or less traditional Marxist terms, that required individuals to decide on direct action.

Editor Buch and other *Literaturmagazin* contributors condemned Enzensberger's *Kursbuch* for its dogmatic and narrow approach to intellectuals' responsibilities. Buch intended not only to engage bourgeois intellectuals but actually also to infiltrate further domains of the public, including engaging with the project of a proletarian public sphere as envisioned by Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge. However, as in chapter 4, I have shown that *Literaturmagazin*'s condemnation of *Kursbuch* ultimately answers the same question from a different angle, rather than being a direct contrast: both journals diagnose the problems of their presents in very similar terms, albeit while offering different solutions. The different magazines' distinctive Marxist approaches around "1968" might well be overlooked, in that they espoused quite similar goals (anti-capitalist transformation of society through a change of consciousness), even as they embraced entirely dissimilar methods on how to achieve them. My comparisons of *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* in chapters 4 and 5 thus highlight the periodicals' use of very comparable publication strategies to very different political ends that generally conform with each other, but which

ultimately vary greatly in implications for audiences and for the future of literature and the arts in the public publishing sphere.

I already outlined in the conclusion of chapter 5 that my examination has documented different angles on the evolution of "literary" magazines in the decade around 1968 and used the contrasts and contradictions between them to demonstrate how varied the Left's responses to critique of the FRG actually were. At no point have I intended a partisan decision about which Marxist agenda might have been the "correct" one, as this would defeat the purpose of Marxist dialectical thought in itself. Nonetheless, having the advantage of hindsight in assessing both journals has also allowed me to reevaluate their agendas with a more critical eye, especially as they represented diagnoses of the West German state in that era of crisis. Both projects rest on assumption that were at the time already subject to interrogation, and that today seem questionable.

For example, Enzensberger claims in 1968 that West Germany was best described only as a "formal democracy" within monopoly capitalism, a democracy in name only that needed to be replaced by an actual democracy (1982 [1968], 142–4). *Kursbuch* was supposed to contribute to the creation of a counter-public which would facilitate such a democratization process, or, as Enzensberger described it, the "political alphabetization of Germany" (1974a [1968], 93). As stated above, participation in the public certainly includes the act of "bringing into the open, an expressing and making public" (Jameson 2008, 218). If we consider *Kursbuch* as "the main public forum for the student movement" (Dirke 1997, 47), it was undoubtedly part of the public sphere. As to whether it can be seen as a counter-public is a different query.

My analysis rather raises the question about whether or not a counter-public within a democracy should be considered a normal or necessary part of the public sphere, and, if so, whether journals such as *Kursbuch* need to be considered part of the establishment themselves (Donahue 2020). Such difficulties are part of the twentieth-century history of Marxisms, and they point toward the larger question: the decision made by both Buch and Enzensberger to use "literary" magazines as instruments of politics, when, traditionally, such magazines have been considered part of a hegemonic elite (whether or not an oppositional one). In not addressing this, Enzensberger is avoiding at least part of the question about his own self-authorization as oppositional. Buch evades the question, as well, but in his insistence on the need for utopian alternatives to real existing images of the world, he is at least not placing his magazine as an *outsider* opposition, no matter that his utopia might be closer to wishes that cannot be fulfilled.

More important is an additional aspect of the two journals' programs: the reform of the literary public sphere itself, in a set of moves designed to remove the oblique and hegemonic political influences of *Group 47* (and its afterlives) on the evolution of literary arts in the FRG. Here again, however, both journals set out with their crusades against *Group 47* and the literary establishment, but, by doing so, arguably actually became the new establishment.[1] While the commercial dominance of *Group 47* was undeniable in its control of book reviewing and book contracting, let us also remember that *Group 47* had a very explicit agenda for its own moment in history: re-creating a literary language for a democratic society stripped of Nazified obfuscations and complicitous mystifications

[1] Major publishing houses published both journals, and, while *Literaturmagazin* lasted until 2001, *Kursbuch* still exists today.

(Donahue 2020). In that light, their annual meetings with readings and arguments need to be seen as instruments for making public outspoken criticism of literature and society (ibid.). The group also did not endorse "literature for literature's sake," but rather, it used its media platforms to engage literature in the public realm of open discourse and criticism (ibid.). That their house critics, especially Marcel Reich-Ranicki, used their power to stifle experimental literature would have made Buch's position particularly political within literary circles, and Enzensberger's rejection of literature a direct snub, political in another way.

In a way, the *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*'s starting points—directed against the West German literary status quo—are also their endpoints: the reflection on the status quo as needing to be updated to motivate readerships to move beyond the state-controlled Consciousness Industry and to find voices that explicitly discuss its limits.

Suppose one were to take the reform of the literary public sphere itself as the journals' primary goal, aiming to combat the oblique and hegemonic political influences mentioned above. In that case, one has to circle back to the question of why they chose literary magazines to begin with, or how one understands what a literary magazine is (not). As I have outlined in chapter 2, parallel to the literary hegemony of *Group 47*, magazines well-established by the 1960s were not sufficient enough for filling the aesthetic and political lacunas identified by many Marxists (Niese 2017, 60).

From this perspective, as I have suggested above, it would be a misdiagnosis to consider *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* "literary magazines" in the traditional sense of "magazines about literature." Put differently, I rely on the fact that the very rubric "literary

magazine" is a false label, unless we understand "literature" in the German sense of *Schrifttum* or *Literatur*, a body of texts. Instead, they should be regarded as art and issue magazines "against (established) literature," intending to break traditions rather than fitting into them. *Kursbuch* was intended to serve up political dissent against reputable magazines of its time, e.g. *Texte und Zeichen* [Texts and Signs] or *Akzente* [Accents] (ibid.). And *Literaturmagazin* was, in turn, a Marxist dissent against *Kursbuch*, among others. I thus argue that scholars need to either widen or change their notion of "postwar periodicals" the same way they have to alter their conception of "postwar Marxism"—both, as I have tried to illustrate in my examination, condition each other.

LIMITS ON AND FUTURE PROSPECTS FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

As the previous chapters exemplified, this project has aimed to show how West German Marxist debates around 1968 attempted to fuse resistance against prevailing politics into a counter-public sphere.

My results suggest that this resistance needs to be seen in several ways, first and foremost as an issue for a Marxist theory original to Germanophone intellectuals. As I have documented in chapter 3, *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* pick up evident elements from the *Realism-Modernism Debate*. Enzensberger and other leftists of the 1960s salute *documentary realism* as "a conquest of reality and a weapon in cognitive struggle" (Jameson 2012, 476). In opposition to that, Buch makes anti-realist and modernist accusations in *Literaturmagazin*'s original call for submissions against Enzensberger's journal and the New Left in general.

As outlined in chapter 3, the revival of this theory debate is a Hegelian *child of its philosophical time* (Hegel 2003 [1821], 21–2). Whereas Bloch and Lukács debated an aesthetic Marxism in the face of Nazi Germany's rising fascism, Buch and Enzensberger did the same in light of Nazi Germany's persistent political and social legacy evident in the Adenauer era. It is therefore no surprise that previous Marxist debates were taken up by West German Marxists in the 1960s and 1970s, as they were trying to create new politics and a new public sphere to resist both pre-1945 Nazi structures as well as post-1945 "hour zero" attempts to restore the German literary mind (*Group 47*).

This statement, however, points to part of the overt limits on my study. Even as I cast my project as part of the *long '68*—a model interpretation so to speak—my work needs to be read as characterizing one moment in the larger whole of the FRG's problem of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* [coming to terms with the past] and as a political address to how the "German mind" helped create the Nazi-era and was bringing that legacy forward into the next generation rather than combatting it. My silencing of other critical Marxist perspectives is thus both regrettable but inevitable. Nonetheless, my goal was not to provide an exhaustive overview of Marxist criticism in the twentieth century or of Marxist oriented literary magazines. My results focus on West Germany at this particular moment, not its East German counterpart or World Marxisms as a whole.

But if we are to consider *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* as two of the most influential magazines of the FRG's second postwar generation, they have to be put into their broader contexts of Marxism. I have shown that both periodicals not only pick up earlier Marxist talking points but also end up in the same anti-dialectical (if not anti-

Marxist) gridlock as their predecessors had: what both journals seem to leave behind is the insight that there cannot be a single *correct* Marxist aesthetic (Arvon 1973 [1970], 2–3). In fact, the 1930's aesthetic debates revived by 1960's West German Marxists reveal a difficulty as old as Marxism itself, namely that "the classic Marxist solution failed, but the problem remains. […] And the only way to remain faithful to Marx today is to stop being a Marxist and to repeat instead Marx's grounding gesture in a new way" (Žižek 2019 [2018], 57–9).

It will be left to a later project to see how *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin*, among others, actually positioned themselves within world Marxist and anti-capitalist thoughts, as well as within the range of German Marxisms. There has been virtually nothing done with positioning such FRG projects against the GDR, for example, which seems surprising given the range of East German authors published in both journals.

Furthermore, I examined Marxist debates in the cultural sphere through the two literary magazines' lenses and not with respect to leftists' party politics per se, either nationally or internationally. I also centered my investigation on the first five years of publication, theoretical and non-fictional genres, and only considered the contributors' side, not even that of the readership (i.e. the rebellious students themselves). Nonetheless, even this limited perspective allows me to assert that they rebuilt part of Germany's Marxist legacy, as I have shown above regarding the *Realism-Modernism Debate*.

Finally, an inevitable dilemma arises: my untangling of different Marxisms around 1968 that aimed at challenging theoretical simplifications can only be a generalization in itself: confining my analysis to two journals that were heavily influenced by their white

male West German founders is, of course, a simplification in itself (Donahue 2020). Thus, further work is also necessary to assess Buch's and Enzensberger's reestablishment of an international Marxist canon comparable to that available to pre-war intellectuals, especially in light of both practical (labor-oriented) concerns, as well as the debates about consciousness that are the project of the *Realism-Modernism Debate*. They assemble their sources carefully to create the cadres of intellectuals that would help them with their respective projects.

However, those limitations aside, my work does open a window into the era's left-wing debates in a way that does not yet exist in the scholarship. By examining various strands of post-1945 West German Marxist thought and connecting them to previous ones, I have documented a disputed and complex intellectual landscape that has not been thoroughly investigated by contemporary scholars; an entirely varied set of sophisticated and well-theorized Critical Theories which, like the event "1968" itself, largely remain "in search of an interpretation" (Müller 2003b, 11).

Thus, my analysis of *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* is critical for future scholarship because it puts their project on a specific place in the map of Marxism (much as I did above by differentiating them from *Group 47* as part of Germany's recovery project). It traces how these two journals each tried to create a counter-public sphere in their responses to their respective historical contexts. As a materialist materialism of Marxist critique, so to speak, these periodicals and their contributors are two generations' (pre- and post-1968) attempts to create public discourses critiquing Germany and the West in particular with the kind of cultural capital critical to their *zeitgeist*.

Additionally, the magazines' history of tension and communication with each other, and the multifaceted Marxist debates and standpoints they symbolize, can legitimately claim to represent a larger map of contemporaneous and yet uncharted Marxisms. My work therefore achieved at least three objectives. First, it went beyond the scholarly canon on their understanding of "literary magazines," and, as I have shown above, began to correct the oversimplified understandings of West Germany's postwar periodicals as redefinitions of a traditional genre. As stated in my introduction, the major surveys on the FRG's literary magazines from the postwar era all stop at 1970. They do justice neither to *Literaturmagazin* as evidence for the *long '68* nor to if and how leftist thought was transforming in the wake of the 1968 student risings. Virtually no work has been done on *Literaturmagazin* at all, and the scholarly landscape has yet not investigated *Kursbuch*'s theoretical and practical key positions before and after "1968" (Niese 2017, 29).

A second large area of the questions I opened if not answered: I challenged the scholarly tendency of simplifying an inherently multilayered and incoherent Marxist agenda around "1968": The Frankfurt School core members Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer simply do not matter in these Marxist debates I am investigating, and the place they claim in West German intellectual life (and that is claimed for them) needs to be reevaluated as another critical node in the constellation of postwar Marxisms.[2] By highlighting the tension between the magazines and other Marxist intellectuals, including the Frankfurt School, I did illustrate that historical and popular memory has underplayed other Marxist theoreticians' contributions to New Left discourse in favor of the focus on

[2] See the introduction's footnote 10 for evidence of such oversimplifications.

"the academics of the Frankfurt School" (Slobodian 2012, 233). Instead, I suggest that *Kursbuch* and *Literaturmagazin* embraced a German Marxist tradition, which acted in stark contrast to Adorno's and Horkheimer's "quite un-Marxist pessimism" (Kandiyali 2019, 480). In fact, both journals should be positioned in the intellectual tradition of those critical opponents of the (postwar) Institute for Social Research, some of which I have already named in my introduction: Karl Korsch, Georg Lukács, Siegfried Kracauer, Erich Fromm, and especially Herbert Marcuse, who frequently appeared in both periodicals.

This leads me to my third result: sketching out a preliminary map for the untold story of the FRG's Marxisms around 1968 that will need to be drawn out in more detail. The twenty-first-century scholarship begins to reveal that "1968" as an intellectual event has been falsified and erased, often by its own protagonists as well as international politics (Vazansky and Abel 2014). Whereas German Studies has produced multiple contesting approaches to "1968" in terms of historical, literary, social, and cultural accounts (Marmulla 2011, 286–90), nuanced perspectives on the intellectual history of West Germany's "1968" are still mostly neglected (Müller 2003a, 117). In fact, the intellectual legacies of "1968" have, with very few exceptions, been purposefully silenced by conservative historical narratives (Hamblin and Adamson 2019, 263–4). The anti-authoritarian, anti-imperialist, and anti-capitalist politics of "1968" have been silenced and reduced in their scope to obscure what was a genuine cultural revolution against the persistence of Nazi legacies in the FRG (ibid.). As a result, the theoretical texts from the "1968" context have barely been analyzed (Hecken 2008, 11). Especially West Germany's 1970s remain widely uncharted in terms of their variety of approaches to Marxism (Niese

2017, 44–5). By showing the internal tensions between Marxist camps in the postwar FRG, my work has challenged the erasure and falsification of West Germany's Marxist left from cultural memory, triggered on the one side by the Cold War and the FRG's integration into the West, on the other, by neoliberal capitalism.

SOME FINAL REMARKS

2018 marked the year of Karl Marx's 200th birthday and also the 50th anniversary of the student movements around 1968, engendering myriads of publications and conferences on both topics. Literary and cultural theorists have begun more and more to reframe 1960s Marxist theory into twenty-first-century contexts genealogically. Recent publications (see the introduction's footnote 11) typify the topicality and relevance of anti-capitalist critique derived from this new generation of Marxist theory. Especially the "global financial crisis of 2007, the worst since the Great Depression of the 1930s, has […] put Marx[ism] back on the agenda" (Kandiyali 2019, 483), making a "critical theory of capitalism […] indispensable for understanding the contemporary world" (Postone 2014 [2009], 41). Or, as Žižek puts it:

> The question of the continuing relevance of Marx's work in our era of global capitalism has to be answered in a properly dialectical way: not only is Marx's critique of political economy, his outline of the capitalist dynamics, still fully actual; one should even take a step further and claim that it is only today, with global capitalism, that, to put it in Hegelese, reality arrived at its notion. (2020, 13)

My dissertation has begun to engage with such international projects above that are reassessing the legacies of Marxism and capitalism in the post-World War II era. As I just noted, future research projects could expand into new forms of literary and cultural public spheres after 1989 and the end of the Cold War, the proverbial "end of history." Mark Fisher's *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?* (Winchester: Zero Books, 2009) raises the kind of questions that need to be pursued, asking if capitalism is the only viable political and economic system and if it is impossible even to imagine a coherent alternative to it within our contemporary late-capitalist public sphere. And, not to trigger a *Realism-Modernism Debate* 3.0, how could such forms and contents look like?

For instance, new data could emerge from post-1989 essay- and memoir-writing, film, and fiction concerning afterlives of "1968" in new transnational, literary, and digital movements. Examples for these cultural productions range from Jürgen Habermas's exhaustive work since German reunification to Alexander Kluge's filmic and digital accomplishments. What are contemporary outlets for generating resistance against prevailing Western politics into a counter-public sphere that could exert actual political force? How are literature, film, or other mediums (e.g. Kluge's television production company *DCTP*) being utilized to interpret and transform international and indigenous anti-capitalist theories to model a new course for what the West's future political direction should look like? And what are today's forms of political activism that intervene in the public sphere? If "1968" continues a debate from the 1930s, how is it continued today? Are we currently into a third-generation post-1989, and what would be its relation to Marxism, now that the Cold War seems to be as much ancient history for many young people as the

1930s? As Žižek keeps insisting: "Marx is a living dead whose ghost continues to haunt us – and the only way to keep him alive is to focus on those of his insights that are today more true than in his own time" (2020, 14).

Bibliography

Abbott, Scott. 2000. "Peter Handke." In *Encyclopedia of German Literature, Volume 1: A–I*, edited by Matthias Konzett, 403–6. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.

Adams, Hazard, and Leroy Searle, eds. 2005. "Quintus Horatius Flaccus." In *Critical Theory Since Plato*, 3rd ed., 78–85. Boston: Thomson Wadsworth.

Adorno, Theodor W. 1982a. *Against Epistemology: A Metacritique. Studies in Husserl and the Phenomenological Antinomies*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———. 1982b. "Commitment." In *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*, edited by Andrew Arato and Eike Gebhardt, 300–318. New York: Continuum.

———. 1991. "The Schema of Mass Culture." In *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, edited by J. M. Bernstein, 53–84. London: Routledge.

———. 2005. *Minima Moralia: Reflections from Damaged Life*. New York: Verso.

Agnoli, Johannes. 1998. *1968 und die Folgen*. Freiburg: Ça ira.

Albrecht, Clemens. 1999. "Die Massenmedien und die Frankfurter Schule." In *Die intellektuelle Gründung der Bundesrepublik. Eine Wirkungsgeschichte der Frankfurter Schule*, edited by Clemens Albrecht, Günter C. Behrmann, Michael Bock, Harald Homann, and Friedrich H. Tenbruck, 203–46. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.

Allott, Nicholas. 2019. "'The Responsibility of Intellectuals': What It Does and Does Not Say." In *The Responsibility of Intellectuals: Reflections by Noam Chomsky and Others after 50 Years*, edited by Nicholas Allott, Chris Knight, and Neil Smith, 1–4. London: University College London Press.

Aly, Götz. 2008. *Unser Kampf 1968 – Ein irritierter Blick zurück*. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer.

Anderson, Kevin B., and Russell Rockwell. 2012. "Introduction." In *The Dunayevskaya-Marcuse-Fromm Correspondence, 1954–1978: Dialogues on Hegel, Marx, and Critical Theory*, edited by Kevin B. Anderson and Russell Rockwell, xv–lix. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Anderson, Perry. 1976. *Considerations on Western Marxism*. London: New Left Books.

Arnold, Heinz Ludwig, ed. 2010. *Text + Kritik Heft 49: Hans Magnus Enzensberger*. Munich: Richard Boorberg.

Arnold, Heinz Ludwig, and Matthias Beilein. 2009. "Vorbemerkung." In *Literaturbetrieb in Deutschland*, edited by Heinz Ludwig Arnold and Matthias Beilein, 9–11. Munich: Edition Text + Kritik.

Arnold, Heinz Ludwig, and Günter Wallraff. 1975. "Gespräch mit Günter Wallraff." *Literaturmagazin* 4: 47–63.

Arvon, Henri. 1973. *Marxist Esthetics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Baer, Nicholas. 2017. "Proposal: Mass and Propaganda. An Inquiry Into Fascist Propaganda (Siegfried Kracauer, 1936)." *Film Studies* 16: 6–15.

Bajohr, Frank, Anselm Doering-Manteuffel, Claudia Kemper, and Detlef Siegfried, eds. 2016. *Mehr als eine Erzählung: Zeitgeschichtliche Perspektiven auf die Bundesrepublik*. Göttingen: Wallstein.

Baxandall, Lee. 1968. *Marxism and Aesthetics: A Selective Annotated Bibliography*. New York: Humanities Press.

Baxandall, Lee, and Stefan Morawski, eds. 1973. *Marx & Engels on Literature & Art: A Selection of Writings*. St. Louis: Telos Press.

Behrmann, Günter C. 1999. "Kulturrevolution: Zwei Monate im Sommer 1967." In *Die intellektuelle Gründung der Bundesrepublik: Eine Wirkungsgeschichte der Frankfurter Schule*, edited by Clemens Albrecht, Günter C. Behrmann, Michael Bock, Harald Homann, and Friedrich H. Tenbruck, 312–86. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.

Beiner, Ronald. 1984. "Walter Benjamin's Philosophy of History." *Political Theory* 12 (3): 423–34.

Benanav, Aaron, and John Clegg. 2018. "Crisis and Immiseration: Critical Theory Today." In *The SAGE Handbook of Frankfurt School Critical Theory*, edited by

Beverley Best, Werner Bonefeld, and Chris O'Kane, 1629–48. London: Sage Publications.

Benjamin, Walter. 1970. "Fragment über Methodenfragen einer marxistischen Literatur-Analyse." *Kursbuch* 20: 1–3.

———. 1982. "The Author as Producer." In *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*, edited by Andrew Arato and Eike Gebhardt, 254–69. New York: Continuum.

———. 2002. *The Arcades Project*. Edited by Rolf Tiedemann. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 2004a. "Announcement of the Journal Angelus Novus." In *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 1: 1913–1926*, edited by Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings, 292–296. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 2004b. "Goethe's Elective Affinities." In *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 1: 1913–1926*, edited by Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings, 297–360. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 2007. "Theses on the Philosophy of History." In *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, 253–64. New York: Schocken Books.

———. 2008. "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version." In *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility, and Other Writings on Media*, edited by Michael W. Jennings, Brigid Doherty, and Thomas Y. Levin, 19–55. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bennett, Tony. 1979. *Formalism and Marxism*. New York: Methuen.

Berg, Jan. 1981. *Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur von 1918 bis zur Gegenwart*. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer.

Berliner Redaktionskollektiv. 1968. "Gewalt." *Konkret – Unabhängige Zeitschrift für Kultur und Politik*, 6: 24–35.

Best, Beverley, Werner Bonefeld, and Chris O'Kane, eds. 2018. *The SAGE Handbook of Frankfurt School Critical Theory*. London: Sage Publications.

Bettig, Ronald V. 2002. "The Frankfurt School and the Political Economy of Communications." In *Rethinking the Frankfurt School: Alternative Legacies of Cultural Critique*, edited by Jeffrey T. Nealon and Caren Irr, 81–94. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bidet, Jacques, and Stathis Kouvelakis, eds. 2008. *Critical Companion to Contemporary Marxism*. Leiden: Brill.

Bloch, Ernst. 1979. "The Meaning of Utopia." In *Marxism and Art: Essays Classic and Contemporary*, edited by Maynard Solomon, 578–82. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

———. 1986. *The Principle of Hope, Volume Three*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———. 1988. "Marxism and Poetry." In *The Utopian Function of Art and Literature: Selected Essays*, 156–62. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

———. 2007. "Discussing Expressionism." In *Aesthetics and Politics: Ernst Bloch, Georg Lukács, Bertolt Brecht, Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno*, 16–27. New York: Verso.

Bohrer, Ashley J. 2019. *Marxism and Intersectionality: Race, Gender, Class and Sexuality under Contemporary Capitalism*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Böhringer, Georg. 1977. "Zeitschriften der jungen Generation." In *Zur literarischen Situation 1945 – 1949*, edited by Gerhard Hay, 86–117. Kronberg: Athenäum.

Boltanski, Luc, and Ève Chiapello. 2018. *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Verso.

Bopp, Jörg. 1984. "Geliebt und doch gehaßt: Über den Umgang der Studentenbewegung mit Theorie." *Kursbuch* 78: 121–42.

Bos, Pascale R. 2014. "Empathy, Sympathy, Simulation? Resisting a Holocaust Pedagogy of Identification." *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 36 (5): 403–421.

Boterman, Frits. 1994. "The Voice of a Lost Generation: Der Ruf. A Post-War Periodical in Germany (1946-1947)." *Yearbook of European Studies* 7: 171–87.

Brecht, Bertolt. 2003. "Breadth and Variety of the Realist Mode of Writing." In *Brecht on Art and Politics*, edited by Tom Kuhn and Steve Giles, 220–27. London: Methuen.

———. 2007a. "Popularity and Realism." In *Aesthetics and Politics: Ernst Bloch, Georg Lukács, Bertolt Brecht, Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno*, 79–85. New York: Verso.

———. 2007b. "The Essays of Georg Lukács." In *Aesthetics and Politics: Ernst Bloch, Georg Lukács, Bertolt Brecht, Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno*, 68–69. London: Verso.

Brelie-Lewien, Doris von der. 1986. *Katholische Zeitschriften in den Westzonen 1945–1949: Ein Beitrag zur politischen Kultur der Nachkriegszeit*. Göttingen: Muster-Schmidt.

Brelie-Lewien, Doris von der, and Ingrid Laurien. 1983. "Zur politischen Kultur im Nachkriegsdeutschland. Politisch-kulturelle Zeitschriften 1945–1949: Ein Forschungsbericht." *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 24 (4): 406–27.

Briegleb, Klaus. 1993. *1968: Literatur in der antiautoritären Bewegung*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Bronner, Eric, and Douglas MacKay Kellner. 1989. "Introduction." In *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader*, edited by Eric Bronner and Douglas MacKay Kellner, 1–21. New York: Routledge.

Brown, Timothy Scott. 2009. "'1968' East and West: Divided Germany as a Case Study in Transnational History." *The American Historical Review* 114 (1): 69–96.

———. 2013. *West Germany and the Global Sixties: The Anti-Authoritarian Revolt, 1962–1978*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buch, Hans Christoph. 1968. "Der 18. Brumaire des Hans-Joachim Lieber." In *Demonstrationen: Berliner Modell. Fotos. 2. Auflage*, 133–42. Berlin: Voltaire.

———. 1969. "Die Kunst als Waffe." *Konkret – Unabhängige Zeitschrift für Kultur und Politik* 26: 45–46.

———. 1970. "Von der möglichen Funktion der Literatur: Eine Art Metakritik." *Kursbuch* 20: 42–52.

———. 1972a. "Einleitung." In *Parteilichkeit der Literatur oder Parteiliteratur?: Materialien zu einer undogmatischen marxistischen Ästhetik*, edited by Hans Christoph Buch, 7–22. Reinbeck/Hamburg: Rowohlt.

———. 1972b. "Kritik der kritischen Kritik. Über Roland Barthes." In *Kritische Wälder: Essays, Kritiken, Glossen*, 69–75. Reinbeck/Hamburg: Rowohlt.

———. 1972c. "Lenin und die Sprache der neuen Linken." In *Kritische Wälder: Essays, Kritiken, Glossen*, 91–96. Reinbeck/Hamburg: Rowohlt.

———. , ed. 1972d. *Parteilichkeit der Literatur oder Parteiliteratur?: Materialien zu einer undogmatischen marxistischen Ästhetik*. Reinbeck/Hamburg: Rowohlt.

———. 1972e. "Postscriptum: Über Dokumentarliteratur und sozialistischen Realismus." In *Kritische Wälder: Essays, Kritiken, Glossen*, 85–88. Reinbeck/Hamburg: Rowohlt.

———. 1972f. "Tarzan oder der Anteil des Imperialismus an der Menschwerdung des Affen." In *Kritische Wälder: Essays, Kritiken, Glossen*, 50–65. Reinbeck/Hamburg: Rowohlt.

———. 1972g. *Ut Pictura Poesis: Die Beschreibungsliteratur und ihre Kritiker von Lessing bis Lukács*. Munich: Carl Hanser.

———. 1972h. "Von der möglichen Funktion der Literatur: Eine Art Metakritik." In *Kritische Wälder: Essays, Kritiken, Glossen*, 75–84. Reinbeck/Hamburg: Rowohlt.

———. 1973. "Rot, röter, am rötesten—Gegen den Vulgärmarxismus in der Literaturkritik." *Literaturmagazin* 1: 24–42.

———. 1975. "Vorbericht." *Literaturmagazin* 4: 11–18.

Buck-Morss, Susan. 2019. *Revolution Today*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Bude, Heinz. 2001. "Achtundsechzig." In *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte, Band II*, edited by Étienne François and Hagen Schulze, 122–34. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Burrough, Bryan. 2015. *Days of Rage: America's Radical Underground, the FBI, and the Forgotten Age of Revolutionary Violence*. New York: Penguin Books.

Canavan, Gerry. 2019. "Utopia." In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Marx*, 425–30. New York: Bloomsbury.

Carey, Elaine, ed. 2016. *Protests in the Streets: 1968 Across the Globe*. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Chomsky, Noam. 1967. "The Responsibility of Intellectuals." *The New York Review of Books* 8 (3): 16–26.

———. 2019. "Remarks on the Historical Context of the Essay 'The Responsibility of Intellectuals.'" In *The Responsibility of Intellectuals: Reflections by Noam Chomsky and Others after 50 Years*, edited by Nicholas Allott, Chris Knight, and Neil Smith, 5–6. London: University College London Press.

Choonara, Joseph. 2019. *A Reader's Guide to Marx's Capital*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Cohen, Robert. 1997. "Expressionismus-Debatte." In *Historisch-kritisches Wörterbuch des Marxismus, Band 3*, edited by Wolfgang Fritz Haug, 1167–1183. Hamburg: Argument.

Colvin, Sarah. 2009. *Ulrike Meinhof and West German Terrorism: Language, Violence, and Identity*. Rochester: Camden House.

Colvin, Sarah, and Katharina Karcher, eds. 2019a. *Gender, Emancipation, and Political Violence: Rethinking the Legacy of 1968*. New York: Routledge.

———. , eds. 2019b. *Women, Global Protest Movements, and Political Agency: Rethinking the Legacy of 1968*. New York: Routledge.

Cooper, David, ed. 1969. *To Free A Generation: The Dialectics of Liberation*. New York: Collier Books.

Cornils, Ingo. 2016. *Writing the Revolution: The Construction of "1968" in Germany*. Rochester: Camden House.

Cottrell, Robert C, and Blaine T. Browne. 2018. *1968: The Rise and Fall of the New American Revolution*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Culler, Jonathan. 1997. *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Daniels, Robert V. 1989. *Year of the Heroic Guerrilla: World Revolution and Counterrevolution in 1968*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Davis, Belinda, Wilfried Mausbach, Martin Klimke, and Carla MacDougall, eds. 2010. *Changing the World, Changing Oneself: Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the U.S. in the 1960s and 1970s*. New York: Berghahn.

Davis, R. G. 1975. "Hans Magnus Enzensberger: A Marxist Media Analysis." *Jump Cut: A Review of Contemporary Media* 8: 25–27.

Debs, Eugene V. 1980. "Sound Socialist Tactics." In *Eugene V. Debs Speaks*, edited by Jean Y. Tussey, 189–99. New York: Pathfinder Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 2006. "May '68 Did Not Take Place." In *Two Regimes of Madness: Texts and Interviews 1975–1995*, edited by David Lapoujade, 233–36. New York: Semiotext(e).

Dirke, Sabine von. 1997. *"All Power to the Imagination!": The West German Counterculture from the Student Movement to the Greens*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Doering-Manteuffel, Anselm. 2000. "Eine neue Stufe der Verwestlichung? Kultur und Öffentlichkeit in den 1960er Jahren." In *Dynamische Zeiten: Die 60er Jahre in den beiden deutschen Gesellschaften*, edited by Axel Schildt, Detlef Siegfried, and Karl Christian Lammers, 661–72. Hamburg: Christians.

Donahue, Neil. Personal Communication (Panel Response, 2020 44th Annual GSA Conference), 09/30/2020.

Douzinas, Costas, and Slavoj Žižek, eds. 2010. *The Idea of Communism*. New York: Verso.

Doyle, William. 2002. *The Oxford History of the French Revolution*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dunn, Allen. 2001. "The Pleasures of the Text: Angelus Novus." *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 84 (1/2): 1–7.

During, Simon, ed. 1993. *The Cultural Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Dutschke, Rudi. 2007. "The Students and the Revolution." In *The Global Revolutions of 1968*, edited by Jeremi Suri, 118–32. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Eagleton, Terry. 1976. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2011. *Why Marx Was Right*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Elbaum, Max. 2002. *Revolution in the Air: Sixties Radicals Turn to Lenin, Mao and Che*. New York: Verso.

Eley, Geoff. 2008. "Telling Stories about Sixty-Eight: Troublemaking, Political Passions, and Enabling Democracy." *German Studies Association Newsletter* 33 (2): 39–50.

Engels, Friedrich. 1973. "Letter to Margaret Harkness." In *Marx & Engels on Literature & Art: A Selection of Writings*, edited by Lee Baxandall and Stefan Morawski, 114–16. St. Louis: Telos Press.

———. 2010. "Letter to Conrad Schmidt." In *Marx & Engels: Collected Works, Volume 49: Letters 1890–92*, 6–9. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Enzensberger, Hans Magnus. 1960. "Vorwort." In *Museum der modernen Poesie*, edited by Hans Magnus Enzensberger, 8–20. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

———. 1962. "Bewußtseins-Industrie." In *Einzelheiten I: Bewußtseins-Industrie*, 7–17. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

———. 1963. "Ins Lesebuch für die Oberstufe." In *Verteidigung der Wölfe*, 85. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

———. 1974a. "Commonplaces on the Newest Literature." In *The Consciousness*

Industry: On Literature, Politics and the Media, edited by Michael Roloff, 83–94. New York: Seabury.

———. 1974b. "Constituents of a Theory of the Media." In *The Consciousness Industry: On Literature, Politics and the Media*, edited by Michael Roloff, 95–128. New York: Seabury.

———. 1974c. "The Aporias of the Avant-Garde." In *The Consciousness Industry: On Literature, Politics and the Media*, edited by Michael Roloff, 16–41. New York: Seabury.

———. 1974d. "The Industrialization of the Mind." In *The Consciousness Industry: On Literature, Politics and the Media*, edited by Michael Roloff, 3–15. New York: Seabury.

———. 1982. "Berlin Commonplaces." In *Critical Essays: Hans Magnus Enzensberger*, edited by Reinhold Grimm and Bruce Armstrong, 138–56. New York: Continuum.

———. 2006. "For a Sixth Form Reader." In *After Brecht: A Celebration*, edited by Karen Leeder, 84. Manchester: Carcanet Press.

———. 2016. "Erinnerungen an einen Tumult: Zu einem Tagebuch aus dem Jahre 1968." In *1968: Eine Enzyklopädie*, edited by Rudolf Sievers, 23–26. Frankfurt a.M.: Edition Suhrkamp.

———. 2018. *Eine Handvoll Anekdoten: Auch Opus incertum*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Enzensberger, Hans Magnus, and Herbert Marcuse. 1970. "USA: Organisationsfrage und revolutionäres Subjekt. Fragen an Herbert Marcuse." *Kursbuch* 22: 45–60.

Enzensberger, Ulrich. 2004. *Die Jahre der Kommune I: Berlin 1967–1969*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.

Eppelsheimer, Hanns-Wilhelm. 1954. "Weltkriege und Weltverständigung: Alliierte Zeitschriften in Deutschland." *Imprimatur: Ein Jahrbuch für Bücherfreunde* 12: 231–34.

Ewen, Jens. 2013. "Der Schriftsteller als Intellektueller: Hans Magnus Enzensbergers

Problematisierungen eines zweihundertjährigen Denkmusters." In *Intellektuelle in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Verschiebungen im politischen Feld der 1960er und 1970er Jahre*, edited by Thomas Kroll and Tilman Reitz, 249–67. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Feenberg, Andrew. 2014. *The Philosophy of Praxis: Marx, Lukács and the Frankfurt School*. New York: Verso.

Fels, Gerhard. 1998. *Der Aufruhr der 68er: Zu den geistigen Grundlagen der Studentenbewegung und der RAF*. Bonn: Bouvier.

Fink, Carole, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker, eds. 1998. *1968: The World Transformed*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fischer, Bernhard, and Thomas Dietzel. 1992. *Deutsche literarische Zeitschriften, 1945–1970: Ein Repertorium, Band 1*. Munich: K. G. Saur.

Fisher, Mark. 2009. *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?* Winchester: Zero Books.

Flacks, Richard. 1998. "Die philosophischen und politischen Ursprünge der amerikanischen New Left." In *1968 – Vom Ereignis zum Gegenstand der Geschichtswissenschaft*, edited by Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey, 151–67. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Foley, Barbara. 2019. *Marxist Literary Criticism Today*. London: Pluto Press.

Forner, Sean A. 2014. *German Intellectuals and the Challenge of Democratic Renewal: Culture and Politics After 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, Michel. 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979*. Edited by Michel Senellart, François Ewald, Alessandro Fontana, and Arnold I. Davidson. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fraser, Nancy. 1985. "What's Critical about Critical Theory? The Case of Habermas and Gender." *New German Critique*, 35: 97–131.

Frei, Norbert. 2008. *1968: Jugendrevolte und globaler Protest*. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

Freud, Sigmund. 2003. *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Penguin Books.

Frisch, Max. 1966. "Erinnerungen an Brecht." *Kursbuch* 7: 54–79.

Fröhner, Rolf. 1962. "Die Zeitschrift, soziologisch betrachtet." *Zeitschrift für Politik* 9 (1): 85–86.

Frow, John. 1986. *Marxism and Literary History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gallas, Helga. 1971. *Marxistische Literaturtheorie: Kontroversen im Bund proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller*. Neuwied; Berlin: Luchterhand.

Gandesha, Samir, and Johan F. Hartle, eds. 2017a. *Aesthetic Marx*. New York: Bloomsbury.

———. 2017b. "Introduction." In *Aesthetic Marx*, edited by Samir Gandesha and Johan F. Hartle, xi–lix. New York: Bloomsbury.

Giefer, Thomas. 2000. "Mord im Kolonialstil: Patrice Lumumba, eine afrikanische Tragödie." In *Tod auf Bestellung*, edited by Heribert Blondiau, 143–173. Berlin: Ullstein.

Gilbert, Jeremy. 2008. *Anticapitalism and Culture: Radical Theory and Popular Politics*. Oxford: Berg.

Gilcher-Holtey, Ingrid. 1998. "Kritische Theorie und Neue Linke." In *1968 – Vom Ereignis zum Gegenstand der Geschichtswissenschaft*, edited by Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey, 168–87. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2004. "Was kann Literatur und wozu schreiben? Das Ende der Gruppe 47." *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* 14 (2): 207–32.

———. 2008. *1968: Eine Zeitreise*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

———. 2018. *Die 68er Bewegung: Deutschland – Westeuropa – USA*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Gildea, Robert, James Mark, and Anette Warring, eds. 2013. *Europe's 1968: Voices of Revolt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gordon, Peter E., Espen Hammer, and Axel Honneth, eds. 2019. *The Routledge Companion to the Frankfurt School*. New York: Routledge.

Gordon, Peter E., and John P. McCormick, eds. 2013. *Weimar Thought: A Contested Legacy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1989. "Prison Notebooks: The Formation of the Intellectuals." In *An Anthology of Western Marxism: From Lukács and Gramsci to Socialist-Feminism*, edited by Roger S. Gottlieb, 113–19. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grange, William. 2009. *Historical Dictionary of Postwar German Literature*. Lanham: Scarecrow.

Griffin, Roger. 2007. *Modernism and Fascism: The Sense of a Beginning under Mussolini and Hitler*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grimm, Reinhold. 1984. *Texturen: Essays und anderes zu Hans Magnus Enzensberger*. New York: Peter Lang.

Große Kracht, Klaus. 2005. *Die zankende Zukunft: Historische Kontroversen in Deutschland nach 1945*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Haacke, Wilmont. 1961. *Die Zeitschrift – Schrift der Zeit*. Essen: Stamm.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1991. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hägglund, Martin. 2019. *This Life: Secular Faith and Spiritual Freedom*. New York: Pantheon.

Haider, Asad. 2018. *Mistaken Identity: Race and Class in the Age of Trump*. New York: Verso.

Haiven, Max. 2020. *Revenge Capitalism: The Ghosts of Empire, the Demons of Capital, and the Settling of Unpayable Debts*. London: Pluto Press.

Hake, Sabine. 2017. *The Proletarian Dream: Socialism, Culture, and Emotion in Germany, 1863–1933*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hamblin, Sarah, and Morgan Adamson. 2019. "Introduction: Legacies of '68: Histories, Geographies, Epistemologies." *Cultural Politics* 15 (3): 263–72.

Hämer, Hardt-Waltherr. 1991. "Berlin: A Testing Ground for Urbanism." *The Unesco Courier*, 1: 33–36.

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2017. *Marx, Capital and the Madness of Economic Reason*. London: Profile Books.

Hecken, Thomas. 2008. *1968: Von Texten und Theorien aus einer Zeit euphorischer Kritik*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. 2003. *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. Edited by Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heißenbüttel, Helmut. 1981. "Bundesdeutsches Zeitschriftenpanorama 1945 bis 1981." In *Literaturbetrieb in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Ein kritisches Handbuch*, edited by Heinz Ludwig Arnold, 43–47. Munich: Edition Text + Kritik.

Hemingway, Andrew, ed. 2006. *Marxism and the History of Art: From William Morris to the New Left*. Ann Arbor: Pluto Press.

Henry, Michel. 2019. *Marx: An Introduction*. London: Bloomsbury.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. 2006. "Critical Forests, or Reflections on the Art and Science of the Beautiful: First Grove, Dedicated to Mr. Lessing's Laocoön." In *Selected Writings on Aesthetics*, edited by Gregory Moore, 51–176. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hillach, Ansgar. 1977. "Walter Benjamin – Korrektiv Kritischer Theorie oder revolutionäre Handhabe? Zur Rezeption Benjamins durch die Studentenbewegung." In *Literatur und Studentenbewegung: Eine Zwischenbilanz*, edited by W. Martin Lüdke, 64–89. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Hodenberg, Christina von, and Detlef Siegfried, eds. 2006. *Wo "1968" liegt. Reform und Revolte in der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Hohendahl, Peter Uwe. 1991. *Reappraisals: Shifting Alignments in Postwar Critical Theory*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Holt, Nadine van. 2009. "Goldsucher und Trüffelschweine: Deutschsprachige Literaturzeitschriften zwischen Existenznot und Entdeckerreichtum." In *Literaturbetrieb in Deutschland*, edited by Heinz Ludwig Arnold and Matthias Beilein, 250–62. Munich: Edition Text + Kritik.

Hooper, Alan. 1999. "A Politics Adequate to the Age: The New Left and the Long Sixties." In *New Left, New Right and Beyond: Taking the Sixties Seriously*, edited by Geoff Andrews, Richard Cockett, Alan Hooper, and Michael Williams, 7–25. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hutchinson, Peter. 2000. "Bertolt Brecht." In *Encyclopedia of German Literature, Volume 1: A–I*, edited by Matthias Konzett, 142–46. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.

Hüttig, Christoph, and Lutz Raphael. 1999. "Die 'Marburger Schule(n)' im Umfeld der westdeutschen Politikwissenschaft 1951–1975." In *Schulen in der deutschen Politikwissenschaft*, edited by Wilhelm Bleek and Hans J. Lietzmann, 293–318. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Jameson, Fredric. 1974. *Marxism and Form: Twentieth-Century Dialectical Theories of Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1984. "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism." *New Left Review* 0 (146): 53–92.

———. 2005. *Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions*. New York: Verso.

———. 2007. "Reflections in Conclusion." In *Aesthetics and Politics: Ernst Bloch, Georg Lukács, Bertolt Brecht, Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno*, 196–213. New York: Verso.

———. 2008. *The Ideologies of Theory*. New York: Verso.

———. 2009. *Valences of the Dialectic*. New York: Verso.

———. 2012. "Antinomies of the Realism-Modernism Debate." *Modern Language Quarterly* 73 (3): 475–85.

———. 2016. "An American Utopia." In *An American Utopia: Dual Power and the Universal Army*, edited by Slavoj Žižek, 1–96. New York: Verso.

Jay, Martin. 1984. *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1996. *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jeffries, Stuart. 2016. *Grand Hotel Abyss: The Lives of the Frankfurt School*. New York: Verso.

Jehle, Peter. 2015. "Literaturkritik." In *Historisch-kritisches Wörterbuch des Marxismus, Band 8/11*, edited by Wolfgang Fritz Haug, Frigga Haug, Peter Jehle, and Wolfgang Küttler, 1229–51. Hamburg: Argument.

Jones, Gareth Stedman. 1991. "Utopian Socialism." In *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, edited by Tom Bottomore, 2nd ed., 561–563. Oxford: Blackwell.

Juchler, Ingo. 1996. *Die Studentenbewegungen in den Vereinigten Staaten und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland der sechziger Jahre: Eine Untersuchung hinsichtlich ihrer Beeinflussung durch Befreiungsbewegungen und -theorien aus der Dritten Welt*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.

Kaes, Anton, ed. 1983. *Weimarer Republik. Manifeste und Dokumente zur deutschen Literatur 1918–1933*. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Kampmann, Elisabeth. 2010. "Public Relations – Enzensberger in den 1950er und 1960er Jahren." In *Text + Kritik Heft 49: Hans Magnus Enzensberger*, edited by Heinz Ludwig Arnold, 114–31. Munich: Richard Boorberg.

Kandiyali, Jan, ed. 2018. *Reassessing Marx's Social and Political Philosophy: Freedom, Recognition and Human Flourishing*. New York: Routledge.

———. 2019. "Western Europe." In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Marx*, edited by Jeff Diamanti, Andrew Pendakis, and Imre Szeman, 479–84. New York: Bloomsbury.

Karsunke, Yaak. 1968. "Anachronistische Polemik." *Kursbuch* 15: 165–68.

Kastner, Jens, and David Mayer, eds. 2008. *Weltwende 1968? Ein Jahr aus globalgeschichtlicher Perspektive*. Vienna: Mandelbaum.

Katsiaficas, George. 2018. *The Global Imagination of 1968: Revolution and Counterrevolution*. Oakland: PM Press.

Kearney, Richard. 1994. *Modern Movements in European Philosophy*. 2nd ed. New York: Manchester University Press.

Kellner, Douglas. 1975. "The Frankfurt School Revisited: A Critique of Martin Jay's The Dialectical Imagination." *New German Critique* 4: 131–52.

———. 1980. "Brecht's Marxist Aesthetic: The Korsch Connection." In *Bertolt Brecht: Political Theory and Literary Practice*, edited by Betty Nance Weber and Hubert Heinen, 29–42. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

———. 1984. *Herbert Marcuse and the Crisis of Marxism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1989. *Critical Theory, Marxism, and Modernity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Keucheyan, Razmig. 2013. *The Left Hemisphere: Mapping Critical Theory Today*. New York: Verso.

King, Alasdair. 2007. *Hans Magnus Enzensberger: Writing, Media, Democracy*. Bern: Peter Lang.

King, Janet K. 1974. *Literarische Zeitschriften 1945–1970*. Stuttgart: Sammlung Metzler.

Királyfalvi, Béla. 1975. *The Aesthetics of György Lukács*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Klimke, Martin. 2010. *The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Klimke, Martin, and Joachim Scharloth, eds. 2008. *1968 in Europe: A History of Protest and Activism, 1956–1977*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Knödler-Bunte, Eberhard. 1975. "The Proletarian Public Sphere and Political Organization: An Analysis of Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge's The Public Sphere and Experience." *New German Critique* 4: 51–75.

Koch, Claus. 2018. *1968: Drei Generationen – Eine Geschichte*. Munich: Random House.

Koenen, Gerd. 2001. *Das rote Jahrzehnt: Unsere kleine deutsche Kulturrevolution, 1967–1977*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.

Kojève, Alexandre. 1980. *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*. Edited by Allan Bloom. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Korsch, Karl. 1977. "Letter to Paul Mattick." In *Karl Korsch: Revolutionary Theory*, edited by Douglas Kellner, 283–85. Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 2016. *Karl Marx*. Leiden: Brill.

Krahl, Hans-Jürgen. 1971. "Antwort auf Jürgen Habermas." In *Konstitution und Klassenkampf: Zur historischen Dialektik von bürgerlicher Emanzipation und proletarischer Revolution. Schriften, Reden und Entwürfe aus den Jahren 1966–1970*, edited by Detlev Claussen, Bernd Leineweber, Ronny Loewy, Oskar Negt, and Udo Riechmann, 242–45. Frankfurt a.M.: Neue Kritik.

Kraushaar, Wolfgang. 1996. "Von der Totalitarismus- zur Faschismustheorie: Zu einem Paradigmenwechsel in der Theoriepolitik der bundesdeutschen Studentenbewegung." In *Die Nacht hat zwölf Stunden, dann kommt schon der Tag: Antifaschismus. Geschichte und Neubewertung*, edited by Claudia Keller, 234–51. Berlin: Aufbau.

———. , ed. 1998a. "Einleitung: Kritische Theorie und Studentenbewegung." In *Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung. Von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail, 1946 bis 1995, Band 1: Chronik*, 17–32. Hamburg: Rogner &

Bernhard.

———. , ed. 1998b. *Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung. Von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail, 1946 bis 1995, Band 1: Chronik*. Hamburg: Rogner & Bernhard.

———. , ed. 1998c. *Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung. Von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail, 1946 bis 1995, Band 2: Dokumente*. Hamburg: Rogner & Bernhard.

———. , ed. 1998d. *Frankfurter Schule und Studentenbewegung. Von der Flaschenpost zum Molotowcocktail, 1946 bis 1995, Band 3: Aufsätze und Kommentare. Register*. Hamburg: Rogner & Bernhard.

———. 2000. *1968 als Mythos, Chiffre und Zäsur*. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.

———. 2008. *Achtundsechzig: Eine Bilanz*. Berlin: Propyläen.

———. 2018. *1968. 100 Seiten*. Ditzingen: Reclam.

Krones, Susanne. 2009. *"Akzente" im Carl Hanser Verlag: Geschichte, Programm und Funktionswandel einer literarischen Zeitschrift 1954–2003*. Göttingen: Wallstein.

Kuhn, Tom, and Steve Giles, eds. 2003. *Brecht on Art and Politics*. London: Methuen.

Kundnani, Hans. 2019. "The Frankfurt School and the West German Student Movement." In *The Routledge Companion to the Frankfurt School*, edited by Peter E. Gordon, Espen Hammer, and Axel Honneth, 221–34. New York: Routledge.

Kunow, Rüdiger. 2015. "Literary Criticism." In *Historisch-kritisches Wörterbuch des Marxismus, Band 8/11*, edited by Wolfgang Fritz Haug, Frigga Haug, Peter Jehle, and Wolfgang Küttler, 1219–28. Hamburg: Argument.

Laakmann, Dagmar, and Reinhard Tgahrt, eds. 1972. *Literarische Zeitschriften und Jahrbücher 1880–1970: Verzeichnis der im Deutschen Literaturarchiv erschlossenen Periodica*. Marbach: Deutsches Literaturarchiv.

Labriola, Antonio. 1908. "Historical Materialism." In *Essays on the Materialist Conception of History*, 93–246. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company.

Laing, Dave. 1986. *The Marxist Theory of Art: An Introductory Survey*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Langston, Richard. 2008. *Visions of Violence: German Avant-Gardes After Fascism*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

———. 2020. *Dark Matter: A Guide to Alexander Kluge and Oskar Negt*. New York: Verso.

Larsen, Ernest, and Sherry Millner. 2019. "Does 68 Minus 18 Equal 50? Encounters, Interventions, Resistances." *Rethinking Marxism* 31 (3): 318–39.

Lau, Jörg. 1999. *Hans Magnus Enzensberger: Ein öffentliches Leben*. Berlin: Alexander Fest.

Laurien, Ingrid. 1991. *Politisch-kulturelle Zeitschriften in den Westzonen, 1945–1949: Ein Beitrag zur politischen Kultur der Nachkriegszeit*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.

Lehmann, Hans-Thies, ed. 1977. *Beiträge zu einer materialistischen Theorie der Literatur*. Frankfurt a.M.: Ullstein.

Lenin, Vladimir. 1976. "Conspectus of Hegel's Book Lectures on the History of Philosophy." In *V.I. Lenin: Collected Works, Volume 38: Philosophical Notebooks*, edited by Stewart Smith, 243–302. Moscow: Progress.

———. 1977a. "How to Organise Competition?" In *V.I. Lenin: Collected Works, Volume 26: September 1917–February 1918*, edited by George Hanna, 404–15. Moscow: Progress.

———. 1977b. "What Is to Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement." In *V.I. Lenin: Collected Works, Volume 5: May 1901–February 1902*, edited by Victor Jerome, 347–567. Moscow: Progress.

———. 1978. "Party Organisation and Party Literature." In *V.I. Lenin: Collected Works, Volume 10: November 1905–June 1906*, edited by Andrew Rothstein, 44–49. Moscow: Progress.

Leslie, Esther. 1999. "Introduction to Adorno/Marcuse Correspondence on the German

Student Movement." *New Left Review* 233: 118–23.

Lettau, Reinhard. 1975. "Eitle Überlegungen zur literarischen Situation." *Literaturmagazin* 4: 19–23.

Lichtheim, George. 1971. *From Marx to Hegel*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Lilla, Mark. 1995. "The Riddle of Walter Benjamin." *The New York Review of Books* 42 (9): 37–42.

Linder, Christian. 1975. "Der lange Sommer der Romantik: Über Hans Magnus Enzensberger." *Literaturmagazin* 4: 85–107.

Löwy, Michael. 2005. *Fire Alarm: Reading Walter Benjamin's "On the Concept of History."* New York: Verso.

Lukács, Georg. 1963. "Critical Realism and Socialist Realism." In *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism*, 93–135. London: Merlin Press.

———. 1971a. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

———. 1971b. "Preface." In *The Theory of the Novel: A Historico-Philosophical Essay on the Forms of Great Epic Literature*, 11–23. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

———. 1971c. "The Writer and the Critic." In *Writer & Critic and Other Essays*, edited by Arthur D. Kahn, 189–226. New York: Grosset & Dunlap.

———. 1972. "Art and Society." *New Hungarian Quarterly* 13 (47): 44–56.

———. 1979. "The Ideology of Modernism." In *Marxism and Art: Essays Classic and Contemporary*, edited by Maynard Solomon, 396–400. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

———. 1981. "Expressionism: Its Significance and Decline." In *Essays on Realism*, edited by Rodney Livingstone, 76–113. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lunn, Eugene. 1982. *Marxism and Modernism: An Historical Study of Lukács, Brecht, Benjamin, and Adorno*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Luxemburg, Rosa. 1961. "Leninism or Marxism?" In *The Russian Revolution and Leninism or Marxism?*, 81–108. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Majut, Rudolf. 1953. "The Cultural Periodicals of Post-War Germany." *German Life and Letters* 7: 17–27.

Mandel, Ernest. 1976. *Late Capitalism*. London: New Left Books.

Mao Tse-tung. 1962. *Talks at the Yenan Forum on Literature and Art*. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.

Marcuse, Herbert. 1970a. *Five Lectures: Psychoanalysis, Politics, and Utopia*. Boston: Beacon.

———. 1970b. "Repressive Tolerance." In *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, edited by Robert Paul Wolff, Barrington Moore Jr., and Herbert Marcuse, 81–117. Boston: Beacon.

———. 1972. *Counterrevolution and Revolt*. Boston: Beacon.

———. 1978. *The Aesthetic Dimension: Toward a Critique of Marxist Aesthetics*. Boston: Beacon.

———. 2007. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. New York: Routledge.

Margadant, Ted W. 1979. *French Peasants in Revolt: The Insurrection of 1851*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Marigold, W.G. 1956. "Some Notes on the Cultural Periodicals of Post-War Germany." *The German Quarterly* 29 (1): 38–42.

Markovits, Andrei S., and Philip S. Gorski. 1993. *The German Left: Red, Green and Beyond*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Marmulla, Henning. 2007. "Das Kursbuch: Nationale Zeitschrift, internationale Kommunikation, transnationale Öffentlichkeit." In *1968: Handbuch zur Kultur- und Mediengeschichte der Studentenbewegung*, edited by Martin Klimke and Joachim

Scharloth, 37–47. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.

———. 2011. *Enzensbergers Kursbuch: Eine Zeitschrift um 68*. Berlin: Matthes & Seitz Berlin.

———. 2013. "Hans Magnus Enzensberger und das 'Kursbuch.'" In *"1968" – Eine Wahrnehmungsrevolution? Horizont-Verschiebungen des Politischen in den 1960er und 1970er Jahren*, edited by Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey, 13–27. Munich: Oldenbourg.

Marsden, John. 1989. "Bloch's Messianic Marxism." *New Blackfriars* 70 (823): 32–44.

Marwick, Arthur. 1998. *The Sixties: Cultural Transformation in Britain, France, Italy and the United States, c.1958–c.1974*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marx, Karl. 1978a. "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Introduction." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 2nd ed., 53–65. New York: Norton.

———. 1978b. "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 2nd ed., 66–125. New York: Norton.

———. 1978c. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 2nd ed., 594–617. New York: Norton.

———. 1978d. "Theses on Feuerbach." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 2nd ed., 143–45. New York: Norton.

———. 2010. "Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association." In *Marx & Engels: Collected Works, Volume 20: Marx and Engels 1864–68*, 441–46. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1978. "Manifesto of the Communist Party." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 2nd ed., 473–500. New York: Norton.

———. 2010. "The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism: Against Bruno Bauer and Company." In *Marx & Engels: Collected Works, Volume 4: Marx and Engels 1844–45*, 5–211. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Mayer, Günter. 1994. "Ästhetik." In *Historisch-kritisches Wörterbuch des Marxismus, Band 1*, edited by Wolfgang Fritz Haug, 648–73. Hamburg: Argument.

McLellan, David. 1981. *Marxism after Marx: An Introduction*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Meinhof, Ulrike Marie. 1967. "Gruppe 47." *Konkret – Unabhängige Zeitschrift für Kultur und Politik* 10: 2–3.

Melin, Charlotte Ann. 2000. "Hans Magnus Enzensberger." In *Encyclopedia of German Literature, Volume 1: A–I*, edited by Matthias Konzett, 250–54. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.

———. 2003. *Poetic Maneuvers: Hans Magnus Enzensberger and the Lyric Genre*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Merkl, Peter H. 1995. "West German Left-Wing Terrorism." In *Terrorism in Context*, edited by Martha Crenshaw, 160–210. University Park: Penn State University Press.

Mewes, Horst. 1973. "The German New Left." *New German Critique* 1: 22–41.

Michael-Matsas, Savas. 2008. "Dialectics and Revolution, Now." In *Dialectics for the New Century*, edited by Bertell Ollman and Tony Smith, 163–78. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Michalzik, Peter. 2002. *Unseld: Eine Biographie*. Munich: Karl Blessing.

Michel, Karl Markus. 1965. "Die sprachlose Intelligenz I." *Kursbuch* 1: 73–119.

———. 1968. "Ein Kranz für die Literatur: Fünf Variationen über eine These." *Kursbuch* 15: 169–86.

Mittenzwei, Werner. 1968. "Marxismus und Realismus: Die Brecht-Lukács Debatte." *Das Argument* 46: 12–43.

Mohr, Reinhard. 2008. *Der diskrete Charme der Rebellion: Ein Leben mit den 68ern*. Berlin: WJS.

Morawski, Stefan. 1970. "The Aesthetic Views of Marx and Engels." *The Journal of*

Aesthetics and Art Criticism 28 (3): 301–14.

Moses, A. Dirk. 2007. *German Intellectuals and the Nazi Past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Müller, Jan-Werner. 2003a. "1968 as Event, Milieu, and Ideology." In *German Ideologies Since 1945: Studies in the Political Thought and Culture of the Bonn Republic*, edited by Jan-Werner Müller, 117–43. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2003b. "Introduction: Putting German Political Thought in Context." In *German Ideologies Since 1945: Studies in the Political Thought and Culture of the Bonn Republic*, edited by Jan-Werner Müller, 1–20. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nassehi, Armin. 2003. *Geschlossenheit und Offenheit: Studien zur Theorie der modernen Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Nealon, Jeffrey T., and Caren Irr. 2002. "Introduction: Rethinking the Frankfurt School." In *Rethinking the Frankfurt School: Alternative Legacies of Cultural Critique*, edited by Jeffrey T. Nealon and Caren Irr, 1–7. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Negt, Oskar, and Alexander Kluge. 1993. *Public Sphere and Experience: Toward an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Newey, Glen. 2009. "The People Versus the Truth: Democratic Illusions." In *Does Truth Matter? Democracy and Public Space*, edited by Ronald Tinnevelt and Raf Geenens, 81–98. New York: Springer.

Niese, Kristof. 2013. "Das Kursbuch und 1968: Ein Fahrplan für die außerparlamentarische Opposition?" In *1968 und die "68er": Ereignisse, Wirkungen und Kontroversen in der Bundesrepublik*, edited by Gerrit Dworok and Christoph Weißmann, 41–67. Vienna: Böhlau Verlag.

———. 2017. *"Vademekum" der Protestbewegung?: Transnationale Vermittlungen durch das Kursbuch von 1965 bis 1975*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1974. *The Gay Science*. Edited by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Books.

Nilges, Mathias. 2019. *Right-Wing Culture in Contemporary Capitalism: Regression and Hope in a Time Without Future*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Nusser, Karl-Heinz. 1978. "Sachliteratur zur Philosophie und Soziologie." In *Kindlers Literaturgeschichte der Gegenwart: Die deutschsprachige Sachliteratur*, edited by Rudolf Radler, 38–94. Munich: Kindler.

Osborne, Peter, Éric Alliez, and Eric-John Russell, eds. 2019. *Capitalism: Concept, Idea, Image – Aspects of Marx's Capital Today*. London: CRMEP.

Paeschke, Hans. 1951. "Der Geist des Auslandes im Spiegel seiner Zeitschriften." *Merkur – Deutsche Zeitschrift für europäisches Denken* 40: 574–87.

Parkes, Stuart. 2000. "Gruppe 47." In *Encyclopedia of German Literature, Volume 1: A–I*, edited by Matthias Konzett, 384–86. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.

———. 2009. *Writers and Politics in Germany, 1945–2008*. Rochester: Camden House.

Peacock, Alan, and Hans Willgerodt, eds. 1989. *Germany's Social Market Economy: Origins and Evolution*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pendakis, Andrew, Jeff Diamanti, Nicholas Brown, Josh Robinson, and Imre Szeman, eds. 2014. *Contemporary Marxist Theory: A Reader*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Petersdorff, Dirk von, ed. 2010. *Hans Magnus Enzensberger und die Ideengeschichte der Bundesrepublik: Mit einem Essay von Lars Gustafsson*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Piwitt, Hermann Peter. 1975. "Rückblick auf heiße Tage: Die Studentenrevolte in der Literatur." *Literaturmagazin* 4: 35–46.

Postone, Moishe. 2014. "Rethinking Marx's Critical Theory." In *Contemporary Marxist Theory: A Reader*, edited by Andrew Pendakis, Jeff Diamanti, Nicholas Brown, Josh Robinson, and Imre Szeman, 41–53. New York: Bloomsbury.

Prawer, Siegbert S. 1983. *Karl Marx und die Weltliteratur*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Pross, Harry. 1963. *Literatur und Politik: Geschichte und Programme der politisch-*

literarischen Zeitschriften im deutschen Sprachgebiet seit 1870. Freiburg: Walter.

Puchner, Martin. 2006. *Poetry of the Revolution: Marx, Manifestos, and the Avant-Gardes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Raabe, Paul, ed. 1985. *The Era of German Expressionism*. Woodstock: The Overlook Press.

Rabert, Bernhard. 1995. *Links- und Rechtsterrorismus in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland von 1970 bis heute*. Bonn: Bernard & Graefe.

Raddatz, Fritz J. 1969. *Marxismus und Literatur*. Reinbeck/Hamburg: Rowohlt.

———. 1972. *Lukács*. Reinbeck/Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Reichardt, Sven, and Detlef Siegfried, eds. 2010. *Das alternative Milieu: Antibürgerlicher Lebensstil und linke Politik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Europa 1968–1983*. Göttingen: Wallstein.

Richter, Hans Werner. 1962. "Fünfzehn Jahre." In *Almanach der Gruppe 47: 1947–1962*, edited by Hans Werner Richter and Walter Mannzen, 8–16. Eschwege: Luchterhand.

Rieser, Max. 1957. "The Aesthetic Theory of Social Realism." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 16 (2): 237–48.

Rim, Byung-Hee. 2000. *Hans Magnus Enzensberger: Ein Paradigma der deutschen Lyrik seit Mitte der 1950er Jahre*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.

Ritter, Christa, and Rainer Langhans. 2005. *Herz der Revolte: Die Kommune 1 von 1967 bis 1969*. Höfen: Hannibal.

Rivkin, Julie, and Michael Ryan, eds. 2004. *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. 2nd ed. Malden: Blackwell.

Roberts, David. 1989. "Introduction: From the 1960s to the 1970s. The Changing Contexts of German Literature." In *After the "Death" of Literature: West German Writing of the 1970s*, edited by Keith Bullivant, xi–xxiii. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Roediger, David R. 2017. *Class, Race, and Marxism*. New York: Verso.

Rose, Margaret A. 1984. *Marx's Lost Aesthetic: Karl Marx and the Visual Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, Jerry. 1970. *Do It! Scenarios of the Revolution*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Sartre, Jean-Paul, and Jacqueline Piatier. 1964. "'A Long, Bitter, Sweet Madness': An Interview with Jean-Paul Sartre." *Encounter* 22 (6): 61–63.

Sasaki, Ryuji. 2021. *A New Introduction to Karl Marx: New Materialism, Critique of Political Economy, and the Concept of Metabolism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schildt, Axel. 2000. "Materieller Wohlstand – pragmatische Politik – kulturelle Umbrüche: Die 60er Jahre in der Bundesrepublik." In *Dynamische Zeiten: Die 60er Jahre in den beiden deutschen Gesellschaften*, edited by Axel Schildt, Detlef Siegfried, and Karl Christian Lammers, 21–53. Hamburg: Christians.

———. 2016. "Fünf Möglichkeiten, die Geschichte der Bundesrepublik zu erzählen." In *Mehr als eine Erzählung: Zeitgeschichtliche Perspektiven auf die Bundesrepublik*, edited by Frank Bajohr, Anselm Doering-Manteuffel, Claudia Kemper, and Detlef Siegfried, 15–26. Göttingen: Wallstein.

Schildt, Axel, and Detlef Siegfried, eds. 2006. *Between Marx and Coca-Cola: Youth Cultures in Changing European Societies, 1960–1980*. New York: Berghahn.

Schildt, Axel, Detlef Siegfried, and Karl Christian Lammers, eds. 2000. *Dynamische Zeiten: Die 60er Jahre in den beiden deutschen Gesellschaften*. Hamburg: Christians.

Schissler, Hanna, ed. 2001. *The Miracle Years: A Cultural History of West Germany, 1949–1968*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Schivelbusch, Wolfgang. 1998. *In a Cold Crater: Cultural and Intellectual Life in Berlin, 1945–1948*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schlant, Ernestine. 1999. *The Language of Silence: West German Literature and the Holocaust*. New York: Routledge.

Schlichting, Hans Burkhard. 1977. "Das Ungenügen der poetischen Strategien: Literatur

im 'Kursbuch' 1968–1976." In *Literatur und Studentenbewegung: Eine Zwischenbilanz*, edited by W. Martin Lüdke, 33–63. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Schmidt, Ulrich. 1993. *Zwischen Aufbruch und Wende: Lebensgeschichten der sechziger und siebziger Jahre*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Schmidtke, Michael. 2003. *Der Aufbruch der jungen Intelligenz: Die 68er Jahre in der Bundesrepublik und den USA*. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.

Schmitt, Hans-Jürgen, ed. 1973. *Die Expressionismusdebatte: Materialien zu einer marxistischen Realismuskonzeption*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Schnell, Ralf. 2003. *Geschichte der deutschsprachigen Literatur seit 1945*. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Schulz, Hans-Joachim. 1993. *German Socialist Literature, 1860–1914: Predicaments of Criticism*. Columbia, SC: Camden House.

Schwab-Felisch, Hans. 1965. "Quality Periodicals [zu deutschen Kulturzeitschriften nach 1945]." *American-German Review* 31 (4): 26–29.

Schweppe, Peter. 2014. "The Politics of Removal: Kursbuch and the West German Protest Movement." *The Sixties: A Journal of History, Politics and Culture* 7 (2): 138–154.

Sepp, Benedikt. 2019. "Fugacious Marxisms: Some Thoughts on the Aesthetics of Marxism in the West German Student Movement (1961–1972)." In *Marxist Historical Cultures and Social Movements during the Cold War: Case Studies from Germany, Italy and Other Western European States*, edited by Stefan Berger and Christoph Cornelissen, 217–234. Cham, CH: Palgrave Macmillan.

Seybold, Matt, and Michelle Chihara, eds. 2019. *The Routledge Companion to Literature and Economics*. New York: Routledge.

Siegfried, Detlef. 2006. *Time Is on My Side: Konsum und Politik in der westdeutschen Jugendkultur der 60er Jahre*. Göttingen: Wallstein.

———. 2018. *1968: Protest, Revolte, Gegenkultur*. Ditzingen: Reclam.

Simon, Claude. 1964. "Whom DOES Sartre Write For?" *The London Magazine* 4 (5): 56–61.

Slobodian, Quinn. 2012. *Foreign Front: Third World Politics in Sixties West Germany*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Solomon, Maynard, ed. 1979. *Marxism and Art: Essays Classic and Contemporary*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Stomps, Victor Otto. 1965. "Die literarischen und Kunst-Zeitschriften." In *Deutsche Presse seit 1945*, edited by Harry Pross, 173–210. Bern: Scherz.

Streeck, Wolfgang. 2016. *How Will Capitalism End? Essays on a Failing System*. New York: Verso.

Szeman, Imre. 2014. "Marxist Literary Theory, Then and Now." In *Contemporary Marxist Theory: A Reader*, edited by Andrew Pendakis, Jeff Diamanti, Nicholas Brown, Josh Robinson, and Imre Szeman, 379–388. New York: Bloomsbury.

Thomas, R. Hinton, and Keith Bullivant. 1974. *Literature in Upheaval: West German Writers and the Challenge of the 1960s*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Thompson, Peter, and Slavoj Žižek, eds. 2013. *The Privatization of Hope: Ernst Bloch and the Future of Utopia*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Thomson, Philip. 2006. "Brecht's Poetry." In *The Cambridge Companion to Brecht*, edited by Peter Thomson and Glendyr Sacks, 2nd ed., 225–41. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Thornhill, Chris. 2000. *Political Theory in Modern Germany: An Introduction*. Malden: Blackwell.

Tiedemann, Rolf. 1970. "Notiz zu einem Fragment Benjamins." *Kursbuch* 20: 5–9.

Tyson, Lois. 2006. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Uelzmann, Jan. 2019. *Staging West German Democracy: Governmental PR Films and*

the Democratic Imaginary, 1953–1963. New York: Bloomsbury.

Varon, Jeremy. 2004. *Bringing the War Home: The Weather Underground, the Red Army Faction, and Revolutionary Violence in the Sixties and Seventies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Vazansky, Alexander, and Marco Abel. 2014. "Introduction: What Was Politics in '1968' in West Germany?" *The Sixties: A Journal of History, Politics and Culture* 7 (2): 83–98.

Vázquez, Adolfo Sánchez. 1973. *Art and Society: Essays in Marxist Aesthetics*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Vazsonyi, Nicholas. 2000. "Georg Lukács." In *Encyclopedia of German Literature, Volume 2: J–Z*, edited by Matthias Konzett, 661–64. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.

Venn, Couze. 2018. *After Capital*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Vinen, Richard. 2018. *1968: Radical Protest and Its Enemies*. New York: HarperCollins.

Vogl, Joseph. 2015. *The Specter of Capital*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Völker, Klaus. 1966. "Brecht und Lukács: Analyse einer Meinungsverschiedenheit." *Kursbuch* 7: 80–101.

Wainwright, Hilary. 1999. "1968's Unfinished Business – Cultural Equality and the Renewal of the Left." In *New Left, New Right and Beyond: Taking the Sixties Seriously*, edited by Geoff Andrews, Richard Cockett, Alan Hooper, and Michael Williams, 125–43. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Wallraff, Günter. 1991. *Industriereportagen: Als Arbeiter in deutschen Großbetrieben*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.

Walser, Martin. 1965. "Unser Auschwitz." *Kursbuch* 1: 189–200.

Wark, McKenzie. 2019. *Capital Is Dead*. New York: Verso.

Weiss, Andreas von. 1969. *Die Neue Linke: Kritische Analyse*. Boppard: Harald Boldt.

Weiss, Peter. 1965. "Frankfurter Auszüge." *Kursbuch* 1: 152–88.

Weiss, Peter, and Hans Magnus Enzensberger. 1966. "Eine Kontroverse." *Kursbuch* 6: 165–76.

Weißmann, Karlheinz. 2018. *Kulturbruch '68: Die linke Revolte und ihre Folgen*. Berlin: Junge Freiheit.

Weitbrecht, Dorothee. 2012. *Aufbruch in die Dritte Welt: Der Internationalismus der Studentenbewegung von 1968 in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Göttingen: V&R unipress.

Weitz, Eric D. 1997. *Creating German Communism, 1890–1990: From Popular Protests to Socialist State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Wesel, Uwe. 2002. *Die verspielte Revolution: 1968 und die Folgen*. Munich: Karl Blessing.

Wieland, Rainer, ed. 1999. *Der Zorn altert, die Ironie ist unsterblich: Über Hans Magnus Enzensberger*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Wiggershaus, Rolf. 1994. *The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories, and Political Significance*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2015. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wolff, Janet. 1991. "Aesthetics." In *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, edited by Tom Bottomore, 2nd ed., 5–8. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wolff, Richard D. 2019. *Understanding Marxism*. New York: Democracy at Work.

Wood, Allen W. 2003. "Editorial Notes." In *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, 381–480. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, Elizabeth. 1989. *Postmodern Brecht: A Re-Presentation*. New York: Routledge.

Wright, Erik Olin. 2019. *How to Be an Anticapitalist in the 21st Century*. New York: Verso.

Zammito, John H. 1984. *The Great Debate: "Bolshevism" and the Literary Left in Germany, 1917–1930*. New York: Peter Lang.

Žižek, Slavoj. 2000. "Class Struggle or Postmodernism? Yes, Please!" In *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, edited by Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Žižek, 90–135. New York: Verso.

———. 2016a. "Foreword: The Need to Censor Our Dreams." In *An American Utopia: Dual Power and the Universal Army*, edited by Slavoj Žižek, vii–viii. New York: Verso.

———. 2016b. "The Seeds of Imagination." In *An American Utopia: Dual Power and the Universal Army*, edited by Slavoj Žižek, 267–308. New York: Verso.

———. 2019. *The Relevance of the Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 2020. *A Left That Dares to Speak Its Name: 34 Untimely Interventions*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Žmegač, Viktor. 1969. *Kunst und Wirklichkeit: Zur Literaturtheorie bei Brecht, Lukács und Broch*. Bad Homburg: Gehlen.